

mendations for the enactment of appropriate legislation "To terminate the state of war between the United States and the Government of Germany" (H. Doc. No. 188); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 4721. A bill to amend section 1073, title 18, United States Code, with respect to indecent molestation or sexual abuse of a minor; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DONOHUE:

H. R. 4722. A bill to empower the Supreme Court of the United States to promulgate a code of ethics for attorneys at law practicing before the district courts of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4723. A bill to amend Veterans' Regulations to establish for persons who served in the Armed Forces during World War II a further presumption of service connection for psychoses developing to a compensable degree of disability within 5 years from the date of separation from active service; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 4724. A bill to facilitate the discharge from the Armed Forces of fathers who apply to come home on account of dependency or hardship; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. HILLINGS:

H. R. 4725. A bill to suspend the running of the statutes of limitations applicable to offenses involving performance of official duties by Government officers and employees during periods of Government service of the officer or employee concerned; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McMILLAN (by request):

H. R. 4726. A bill to amend section 15 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 4727. A bill to amend title I of the Social Security Act to provide additional requirements for State plans for old-age assistance; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 4728. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the decentralization of certain Government personnel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. McGRATH:

H. R. 4729. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, to further promote the development and maintenance of the American merchant marine, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. HOLIFIELD:

H. R. 4730. A bill to amend or repeal certain laws relating to Government records, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

By Mr. JAVITS:

H. R. 4731. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

H. R. 4732. A bill to amend the Railroad Retirement Act of 1937, as amended, so as to provide full annuities, at compensation of half salary or wages based on the five highest years of earnings, for individuals who have completed 35 years of service or have attained the age of 60; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULTON:

H. R. 4733. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MORANO:

H. R. 4734. A bill to prohibit discrimination in employment because of age; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RABAUT:

H. Res. 318. Resolution authorizing the purchase of electric office equipment for use by Members, officers, and committees of the House of Representatives; to the Committee on House Administration.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to authorizing the Federal Security Administrator to bring to Washington, D. C., theater productions of land-grant and State and other accredited colleges and universities; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the President and the Congress of the United States relative to requesting the passage of H. R. 2815 (1951) or other proper legislation to bring about reciprocal trade agreements providing for duty-free mutual transshipments of crude petroleum between the United States and the Dominion of Canada; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN of California (by request):

H. R. 4735. A bill for the relief of Denning Mills, a copartnership; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANDERSON of California:

H. R. 4736. A bill for the relief of Pierino Pavese; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. BOLTON:

H. R. 4737. A bill for the relief of Victor Romond; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHELLEY:

H. R. 4738. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Amy Isabel Ericsson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 4739. A bill for the relief of Gordon Victor Currie; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

TUESDAY, JULY 10, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, June 27, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. J. Warren Hastings, Ph. D., minister of the National City Christian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Father, we thank Thee for every blessing that Thou hast bestowed upon us. We thank Thee for the high and noble

heritage that Thou hast bequeathed to us. We thank Thee for the ideals that inspired us in our youth. We thank Thee for the high calling of service to our country. Thou hast been a good God to us.

We beseech Thee, dear Father, that we may be true to our finer selves, be ever aware of the noble ideals which have inspired our lives, and thus serve Thee with highest loyalty.

Be with our representatives today as they engage in the deliberations which we pray will lead to peace. Give them discriminating insight, a constant sense of high mission, the consciousness that we are solidly behind them, and the acute awareness of the presence of Thy spirit. And may peace cover the earth as the waters cover the sea as a result of their consecrated efforts, and the efforts of all men of good will.

In the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Monday, July 9, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting a nomination was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators who so desire may make insertions in the RECORD and transact other routine business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate and referred as indicated:

By the VICE PRESIDENT:

The petition of Mrs. John Henry McCreary, of Cambridge, Mass., praying for the enactment of legislation to provide price controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The petition of Mrs. Edna B. Drayton and Alvin P. Drayton, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to continue rent controls; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A letter in the nature of a petition from the Mothers' Club of Public Schools 84 and 8, Long Island City, N. Y., signed by Eileen Whelpley, corresponding secretary, praying for the enactment of legislation to provide adequate appropriations for the expansion of personnel to guard all ports of entry against the illegal importation of narcotics, and so forth; to the Committee on Appropriations.

The petition of Edna Carmine, of Preston, Md., relating to the taxation of cooperatives; to the Committee on Finance.

A letter in the nature of a memorial from the Jewish Family Service Association, of Cleveland, Ohio, signed by Gabriel Leeb, president, remonstrating against the Jenner amendment relating to public inspection of assistance records to House bill 3709, the Federal Security appropriation bill; to the Committee on Appropriations.

The memorial of Mr. and Mrs. Mason, of New York City, N. Y., remonstrating against the tax on dividends (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

FLOOD WALL AT COVINGTON, KY.—LETTER AND RESOLUTION

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. UNDERWOOD], I present a letter, dated July 2, 1951, from Stanley Chrisman, Esq., city solicitor of the city of Covington, Ky., transmitting copy of a resolution adopted by the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Covington, urging appropriation of the necessary funds with which to complete the flood wall at Covington, Ky.

I ask unanimous consent that Mr. Chrisman's letter and the resolution be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE CITY OF COVINGTON, KY.,
OFFICE OF THE CITY SOLICITOR,
July 2, 1951.

The Honorable EARLE CLEMENTS,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: There is enclosed herein a resolution passed by the Board of City Commissioners of the City of Covington, Ky., requesting that the United States Government restore the \$1,400,000 flood-wall appropriation which had been allocated for the completion of the flood wall in this city, and was taken out of the appropriation by the House of Representatives.

If the flood wall is permitted to remain in its present condition, it would be but half completed, and will be of little or no benefit to the entire city. There is also located in this area St. Elizabeths Hospital, which is the largest hospital in this area, and serves people in the various counties adjacent to the city of Covington.

Trusting that you will give this matter every consideration possible, I am,

Very truly yours,

STANLEY CHRISMAN,
City Solicitor.

Commissioners' Resolution R-59-51

Resolution requesting the United States Government to reconsider the appropriation for the continuation of the city of Covington flood wall and replacing the appropriation in the Federal budget

Whereas the city of Covington did enter into an agreement with the United States Government, which agreement required that the city provide certain moneys for acquiring rights-of-way, easements, and/or property on which the United States Government was to construct a flood wall on the north and east fronts of the city; and

Whereas the city of Covington did cause the matter of obtaining the necessary moneys for carrying out its obligations under the agreement to be submitted to the electorate of the city, that said electorate did vote authority to the city to issue and sell bonds to obtain the necessary moneys for such purpose, and that bonds were issued and sold in accord with such authority so granted; and

Whereas moneys so obtained have been and are being used for the purposes aforesaid and the city of Covington has been and is paying interest on the bonds so issued and sold and the unexpended portion of the moneys not already used for the purposes intended is still in hand and cannot be invested for profit while the completion of the flood-wall construction is being delayed; and

Whereas that portion of the flood wall on which construction is now being delayed is

not a new project but is a fundamental part of the original project involved when the city of Covington entered into its agreement with the United States Government, which agreement covered the construction of flood wall for the protection of the city on its north and east fronts; and

Whereas many thousands of dollars in damage is done to streets, sewers, water and gas mains, and other utilities, as well as to other property of Covington citizens, and streets are littered with mud and debris and insanitary and unhealthful conditions arise during flood times which will require that residents of the entire eastern portion of the city leave their homes and seek temporary living quarters elsewhere, which conditions put the city to considerable expense; and

Whereas it is manifestly unfair to the residents of the eastern portion of the city for them to be left without flood protection when such residents have been and are paying for the flood wall which has been built for the protection of residents of the northern and western portions of the city and from which such residents are receiving much less protection than the complete project contracted for was designed to give them; and

Whereas the construction agreement dated May 17, 1951, of certain interceptor sewers by the Campbell-Kenton County Sanitary Commission, which was in immediate prospect as the result of contracts between such commission and the city of Covington, which contracts were predicated on the United States Government and the said Commission dividing the cost of construction of interceptor sewers designed for the relief of the city of Covington as well as for normal drainage of the flood wall itself, at a considerable saving of money for both the United States Government and for the said commission; and

Whereas failure to complete the work already well along on the flood wall protection of and for the city of Covington can result in the loss of the facilities of St. Elizabeths Hospital, the largest institution of its kind in the northern section of the State, if and when flood conditions arise which would deprive the community of the use of such 350-bed facilities at the time when they could and would be used most effectively, which condition has arisen heretofore and can again occur; and

Whereas the city of Covington has been and is carrying out all its obligations under the agreement entered into with the United States Government, and such United States Government has not completed its obligation and is now delaying the completion of its obligation under said agreement: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Board of Commissioners of the City of Covington, Ky.:

SECTION 1. That the Members of the United States Senate and the Members of the United States House of Representatives exert any and all effort and influence to see that the United States Government carry out its obligation as entered into under the agreement with the city of Covington, by the appropriation of \$1,400,000 for the continuation of the erection and construction of the flood-protection wall in the city of Covington, and by including said appropriation in the Federal budget for the ensuing fiscal year.

SEC. 2. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the United States Senate Committee on Appropriations, the House of Representatives Committee on Appropriations, the President and the Vice President of the United States, all senatorial and congressional representatives of the State of Kentucky, the United States engineer at Washington, D. C., the United States district engineer at Louisville, Ky., and the United States engineer's offices at Covington, Ky.

SEC. 3. An emergency is hereby declared to exist, and this resolution shall be in full force and effect upon its first reading and publication.

WM. F. ROLFES,
Mayor.

ROLE OF IRREGULAR AIRLINES IN UNITED STATES AIR TRANSPORTATION INDUSTRY—REPORT OF SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS (S. REPT. NO. 540)

Mr. DUFF, from the Select Committee on Small Business, submitted a report on the Role of Irregular Airlines in United States Air Transportation Industry, which was ordered to be printed.

ORGANIZATION OF CONGRESS—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS (S. DOC. NO. 51)

Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, submitted a report covering in detail some of the more troublesome problems relating to committee jurisdiction in selected subject-matter fields, compiled at the direction of the committee in connection with its review and evaluation of the operations of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, which was ordered to be printed as a Senate document.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following reports were received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JULY 6, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1951, to June 30, 1951, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
C. M. Mouser, chief clerk ¹	\$8,438.93	\$2,812.96
James M. Kendall, assistant chief clerk	7,941.22	3,812.23
Jean Douglas, clerical assistant ²	3,632.97	898.13
Harriet D. Willey, clerical assistant ²	3,632.97	898.13
Joycette K. Jones, chief clerk ³	7,775.31	971.91

¹ Service began Mar. 1, 1951.

² Service began Apr. 2, 1951.

³ Service terminated Feb. 15, 1951.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure..... \$10,000.00
Amount expended..... 902.23

Balance unexpended..... 9,097.77

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman.

JULY 6, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON UTILIZATION OF FARM CROPS, PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 351, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Con-

gress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1951, to June 30, 1951, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Paul E. Hadlick, counsel ¹	\$10,846.00	\$903.83
Albert J. Wolken, investigator ¹	7,858.27	654.85

¹ Service terminated Jan. 31, 1951.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure.....	\$50,000.00
Amount expended.....	30,956.25
Balance unexpended.....	19,043.75

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman.

JULY 6, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

SUBCOMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE MEANS OF STIMULATING SURPLUS AGRICULTURAL COMMODITY EXPORTS, PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 173, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1951, to June 30, 1951, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Rollis S. Nelson, investigator ¹	\$7,858.27	\$43.65

¹ Service terminated Jan. 2, 1951.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure.....	\$25,000.00
Amount expended.....	9,557.56
Balance unexpended.....	15,442.44

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman.

JULY 6, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON FOOT-AND-MOUTH DISEASE, PURSUANT TO SENATE RESOLUTION 223, EIGHTIETH CONGRESS, AS CONTINUED BY SENATE RESOLUTION 72, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1951, to June 30, 1951, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

No expenditure for personnel.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure.....	\$8,000.00
Amount expended.....	2,348.47
Balance unexpended.....	5,651.53

ALLEN J. ELLENDER,
Chairman.

JULY 11, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1951, to June 30, 1951, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
A. Lee Parsons, chief clerk.....	\$10,846.00	\$5,423.00
Joseph P. McMurray, staff director.....	10,846.00	5,423.00
William F. McKenna, counsel.....	10,846.00	5,423.00
Robert D. L'Heureux, counsel.....	10,846.00	5,423.00
Thomas H. Daniel, counsel.....	10,846.00	5,423.00
Raimond Bowles, assistant clerk.....	10,846.00	5,423.00
Eunice V. Avery, clerical assistant.....	5,892.43	2,946.22
Henrietta S. Chase, clerical assistant.....	5,371.02	2,436.36
Pauline C. Beam, clerical assistant.....	4,849.61	2,217.17
Caro M. Pugh, clerical assistant.....	4,849.61	2,217.17

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure.....	\$10,000.00
Amount expended January 1 through June 30, 1951.....	4,684.59
Balance unexpended.....	5,315.41

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman.

JULY 11, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY UNDER AUTHORITY OF SENATE RESOLUTION 64

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from February 15, 1951, to June 30, 1951, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
John L. Douglas (from Feb. 16, 1951), staff assistant.....	\$7,858.27	\$2,946.83
Carter E. Talman (from Feb. 16, 1951), staff assistant.....	7,858.27	2,946.83
Ann Livingston (Feb. 16 to Mar. 15), clerical assistant.....	3,632.97	302.74
James H. Foley (May 1 to June 15), investigator.....	4,849.61	606.19
Stephanie E. Lojewski (May 1 to June 15) clerical assistant.....	4,067.49	408.42
John T. M. Reddan (May 1 to June 30), special counsel.....	10,846.00	1,807.66

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure.....	\$50,000.00
Amount expended, Feb. 15 through June 30.....	12,097.59
Balance unexpended.....	37,902.41

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman.

JULY 11, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION, OPERATING UNDER AUTHORITY OF SENATE RESOLUTION 307 AND SENATE RESOLUTION 17

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Con-

gress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1951, to April 30, 1951, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Edith H. Anderson (through Jan. 15, 1951), clerical assistant.....	\$4,067.49	\$169.47
William A. Brewer (through Jan. 15, 1951), investigator.....	5,805.53	241.89
James H. Foley, investigator.....	4,849.61	1,616.52
Stephanie E. Lojewski, clerical assistant.....	4,067.49	1,355.80
Helene Fischell (through Jan. 15, 1951), clerical assistant.....	4,067.49	169.47
John T. M. Reddan, special counsel.....	10,846.00	3,615.32
William A. Brewer (per diem), investigator.....	30.13	542.29

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure: Balance Jan. 1, 1951.....	\$29,467.80
Amount expended Jan. 1 through Apr. 30, 1951.....	29,383.43
Balance unexpended.....	\$4.37

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman.

JULY 11, 1951.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

SUBCOMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS, OPERATING UNDER AUTHORITY OF SENATE RESOLUTION 218

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from January 1, 1951, to February 15, 1951, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
John L. Douglas, investigator.....	\$7,858.27	\$982.27
Sarah I. Harley, clerical assistant.....	4,067.49	508.42
Ann Livingston, clerical assistant.....	3,632.97	454.11
William C. Stewart, Jr., investigator.....	7,858.27	982.27
Carter E. Talman, financial adviser.....	7,858.27	982.27

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure: Balance Jan. 1, 1951.....	\$4,873.45
Amount expended Jan. 1 thru Feb. 15, 1951.....	4,020.03
Balance unexpended.....	\$853.42

BURNET R. MAYBANK,
Chairman.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 1822. A bill to amend the act creating a juvenile court for the District of Columbia, approved March 19, 1906, as amended; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KERR:

S. 1823. A bill to extend medical, hospital, and domiciliary care to certain citizens of the United States who served in the active military or naval service of any government

allied with the United States during World War II; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

By Mr. HOLLAND:

S. 1824. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claims of Trent Trust Co., Ltd., Honolulu, T. H.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RUSSELL (by request):

S. 1825. A bill to extend to the Panama Canal and Panama Railroad Company provisions of the act entitled "An act to facilitate the settlement of the accounts of certain deceased civilian officers and employees of the Government," approved August 3, 1950;

S. 1826. A bill to authorize the appointment of Joseph F. Carroll as a permanent colonel in the Regular Air Force; to the Committee on Armed Services.

S. 1827. A bill to provide for the withholding of certain patents that might be detrimental to the national security, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1828. A bill to exempt certain civilian employees of the Department of Defense from the laws governing the employment, removal, classification, pay, retirement, leave and disability and death compensations of Federal officers and employees; and

S. 1829. A bill to repeal the provision of the act of July 1, 1902 (32 Stat. 662), as amended, relating to pay of civilian employees of the Navy Department appointed for duty beyond the continental limits of the United States and in Alaska; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. YOUNG:

S. 1830. A bill to amend the act of October 29, 1949, Public Law 437, Eighty-first Congress, entitled "An act to vest title to certain lands of the Three Affiliated Tribes of the Fort Berthold Reservation, N. Dak., in the United States, and to provide compensation therefor," and to add to said act certain supplemental provisions; and

S. 1831. A bill authorizing the transfer to the Bureau of Indian Affairs of certain property for use of the Standing Rock Indian Reservation, N. Dak.; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. 1832. A bill for the relief of Ella Henriette Nielsen Bonnerup; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1833. A bill for the relief of Barbara Jean Takada; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HENDRICKSON:

S. 1834. A bill to provide advanced retired rank for certain members of the Armed Forces specially commended for bravery in actual combat in each of any two wars in which the United States has been engaged, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. RUSSELL (by request):

S. J. Res. 83. Joint resolution to authorize appropriate participation by the United States in commemoration of the one hundred and fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the United States Military Academy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. KERR submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year 1952, and for other purposes, which were ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

Mr. MAGNUSON submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to House bill 3790, supra, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE AND VOCATIONAL EDUCATION ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. HILL submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 337) to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

APPOINTMENT OF ADDITIONAL CIRCUIT AND DISTRICT JUDGES—AMENDMENT

Mr. EASTLAND submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1203) to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, and ordered to be printed.

USE OF CERTAIN INDIAN TRIBAL FUNDS—AMENDMENT

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska (for himself and Mr. MALONE) submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by them, jointly, to the bill (H. R. 3795) to provide for the use of the tribal funds of the Ute Indian Tribe of the Uintah and Ouray Reservation, to authorize a per capita payment out of such funds, to provide for the division of certain tribal funds with the Southern Utes, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

WILLIAM O. STEVENS—CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], is attending a committee meeting, and has asked me to submit the following request:

On June 7, 1951, there was referred to the Committee on Armed Services the bill (H. R. 662) for the relief of William O. Stevens. Three similar bills, covering the payment of retirement annuities to civilian members of the teaching staff of the Naval Academy, have been handled by the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

Therefore, on behalf of the chairman of the Armed Services Committee, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Armed Services be discharged from the further consideration of House bill 662, and that it be referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, and so forth, were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. WHERRY:

Editorial entitled "What Is Federal Aid?" published in the May 1951 issue of Nebraska Agriculture.

By Mr. HILL:

Article regarding the struggle in Korea entitled "They Kept the Road Open," written

by Ralph McGill and published in the Atlanta Constitution.

By Mr. AIKEN:

Two editorials regarding the St. Lawrence seaway, the first entitled "The St. Lawrence Seaway," published in the Washington Star of July 10, 1951, the second entitled "Case of Split Personality," written by Lowell Mellett, and published in the Washington Star of June 30, 1951.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

Article entitled "Schoolroom Embassies," written by Roy Tasco Davis, reprinted from the State Department Record for January 1949.

By Mrs. SMITH of Maine:

Article entitled "Spirit of '76 Challenged Again," written by James Morgan, and published in the Boston Globe of July 1, 1951.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

Article entitled "Shameful Chapter in History," written by David Lawrence, and published in the Washington Evening Star of July 10, 1951.

By Mr. HUNT:

Article entitled "Consumers May Get Into the Act," written by Lowell Mellett, and published in the Washington Evening Star of July 7, 1951, discussing means to offset pressure of special interests on Congress.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

Editorial entitled "He Should Make a Good Judge," and an article entitled "Good Government Platform Has Been Youngdahl's Pride," published in the Washington Star of July 6, 1951.

Editorial entitled "Unification of Korea Not Our Military Aim," published in the Minneapolis Morning Tribune of June 27, 1951.

Editorial entitled "The GI Bill," published in the St. Paul Dispatch of June 26, 1951, dealing with the GI bill of rights.

THE THIRTY-EIGHTH PARALLEL AS A BOUNDARY BETWEEN THE COMMUNIST AND UNITED NATIONS FORCES—LETTER FROM SENATOR DOUGLAS TO GENERAL MARSHALL

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD for the information of Senators a copy of a letter which I have had delivered to Secretary of Defense George C. Marshall earlier today on the question of why I believe the United Nations should not accept the thirty-eighth parallel as the dividing line between the Communist and the United Nations forces.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
July 10, 1951.

HON. GEORGE C. MARSHALL,
Secretary of Defense,
Department of Defense,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GENERAL MARSHALL: Now that the cease-fire negotiations in Korea have reached the critical stage, I recognize that the pressures upon you and upon others responsible for our policy are enormous. The decisions we must make are of grave import for our own country, for the UN and for the cause of freedom everywhere.

While I do not have access to all of the information available to you and cannot presume to set my judgment up as a final one, I am so deeply concerned over one immediate aspect of the armistice discussions that I want to share with you my own analysis of this question before the basic decisions are made. It is my earnest hope that a temperate public consideration of these issues may assist in the achievement of an informed public opinion and a workable cease-fire agreement.

While we all welcome the possibility that an honorable and lasting peace may develop in Korea, there is one point above all others about which we should be very careful. That is the seeming acceptance by our allies and apparently also by our State Department that the line of division between the Communist forces and our own is to be at the thirty-eighth parallel.

It is true that for the moment all that is under discussion is a "cease-fire" agreement at or near this line. But there is great danger that once such a line is accepted, it may harden into a permanent arrangement and that we will ultimately return to the same division of Korea as existed before the attack, namely at the thirty-eighth parallel.

I think I am aware of the forces which are operating and the arguments being advanced in favor of such a settlement. Our allies in the United Nations, particularly Great Britain and those who have never been enthusiastic about taking up arms in defense of Korea, are anxious to get the hostilities over with as soon as possible. Quite naturally they do not want to become embroiled in a third world war because of Korea, and they want to husband their and our resources for other possible trials of strength in which their own interests are more immediately involved. These countries individually and the United Nations collectively are therefore strongly urging that we accept the thirty-eighth parallel as the dividing line. Since the State Department deals primarily with foreign countries, it is but natural that it should be impressed with this point of view.

In the second place, public opinion in this country is undoubtedly getting somewhat weary of the struggle which has now cost us approximately 80,800 battle casualties. It may well be that such a settlement would be initially popular.

Thirdly, after a year of heavy fighting, we are only a little way north of the thirty-eighth parallel and there is a natural tendency for us to say to ourselves that our mission has been accomplished, now that we have restored the line which existed prior to the attack of the North Koreans and that we should not push further.

But while I can appreciate the motives back of this acceptance of the thirty-eighth parallel and do not wish to disparage them, I must say in all frankness that I believe it would be a calamity for both military and psychological reasons for it to be adopted as the basis for peace. Since we may have only a few hours before the fateful decision is finally made, I feel it proper to express my reasons for this belief. I know how difficult the choices are, and I shall not question the motives of those who think differently. I ask only that the reasons be considered.

I. It would permit the Communists to build up their strength north of the thirty-eighth parallel so that their forces would continue to threaten the independence of South Korea. It is 235 miles from the thirty-eighth parallel to the Manchurian border and prior to hostilities, this northern territory had approximately 10,000,000 inhabitants. This would give the Communists both the depth in which they could organize and deploy armies and a large population which they could enslave and press into military service. Southern Korea and the nations which are pledged to defend it would therefore be forced to live in constant suspense under the continuing threat of a further Communist attack at a time opportune to them.

But at this point someone is likely to object that officials of the United Nations would be able to inspect the area north of the boundary and either prevent such Communist forces from being built up or give us ample warning if they were.

This I submit is a fantasy. The Communists have never permitted U. N. inspectors or agents within their borders. They did

not permit them inside the Balkans, and in North Korea itself they refused to let the U. N. electoral representatives get an inch north of the thirty-eighth parallel. Whenever and wherever the Communists take over, they lower the iron curtain and there is no ingress.

Even if they agreed to such international inspection as a condition of the cease-fire, we could not rely on their keeping this agreement, without a U. N. army of occupation north of the thirty-eighth degree line to enforce it. In the meantime we would have laid down our arms and it would be hard to take them up again. I believe it would be much harder to persuade our U. N. associates and our own people to start enforcement operations should the Communists violate an inspection agreement than it would be to hold out for a more defensible line now while our forces are still in the field.

II. The second weakness of the thirty-eighth parallel is that it is almost impossible to defend. It is a wholly artificial line approximately 150 miles long with few or no topographical strong points for defense. It would require a considerable number of well-armed divisions to furnish an adequate defense. The thirty-eighth parallel, therefore, has nothing to recommend it from a military point of view. It was chosen in 1945 either accidentally or because it had previously marked the zone of influence of Czarist Russia. Since we are still determined to resist aggression and have had conclusive proof of the danger of such aggression from North Korea, we cannot content ourselves in restoring the indefensible former line in the pious hope the Communists will not do it again.

III. But, most important of all, the adoption of the thirty-eighth parallel as the dividing line would inevitably be turned into a great propaganda victory for the Chinese Communists. They would proclaim throughout Asia that they had driven our forces and those of the U. N. from our positions of last November back to the thirty-eighth parallel and that they had won a crushing victory. Instead of losing face, they would gain it. This is of crucial importance in the Orient and would undoubtedly help to swing tens of millions into the Communist camp.

Our prestige is already being weakened by sending emissaries under the protection of the white flag into the Communist-held town of Kaesong to negotiate a truce. These men have been frequently photographed by the Communist news photographers who were on hand and posters of their entrance will soon be distributed all over Asia. Since the white flag is the symbol of surrender as well as of a truce, such photographs will be hailed in the absence of other facts as proof positive that the Chinese Communists have won, and we have lost, the war in Korea. I want to make it clear that I do not say that an armistice at the thirty-eighth parallel would actually be a defeat. But I do want to emphasize that it will be so interpreted in Asia, and by some elements in our own country.

For all these reasons, I submit that in the long-run interests of peace and of preventing the renewal of aggression there, we should not make the thirty-eighth parallel the dividing line between the two forces, but that it should, if possible, be fixed appreciably to the north of this.

I would tentatively suggest (1) that the line should run across the so-called "neck" of Korea, approximately 100 miles north of the thirty-eighth and between Anshu and Elko; (2) that the power plants on the south bank of the Yalu River and the transmission lines through Korea should at the same time be put under U. N. control; and (3) that in the long run, we should strive for a completely united Korea free of any outside domination, which was the objective of the U. N. before the aggression.

The advantages of such an arrangement and more particularly of the more northerly line of division are obvious. (1) In the first place, it would restore the vast proportion of the territory and the people of Korea to a unified country. At least four-fifths of the population would be under U. N. protection, and this proportion would be still further raised as the North Koreans would come out of the hills to live under the greater security and freedom enjoyed by those in the non-Communist section. It would be far less possible, therefore, for the Chinese Communists to force appreciable numbers of Koreans into their armed forces. Their military strength would be greatly weakened, and if they attacked southward again they could not effectively pretend that they were leading a Korean army of liberation.

(2) The "neck," as the narrowest part of the whole Korean Peninsula, is far more defensible from a military standpoint than is the thirty-eighth parallel. It is, for example, approximately only 90 miles long as compared to 150 miles at the thirty-eighth parallel. It can, therefore, be held with fewer divisions, and a smaller total force can provide greater defense in depth. While no line can be fixed that will eliminate all future risks, the line at the neck seems best devised to minimize those risks.

(3) Only such a line or one still further to the north would permit our helping in the economic and social reconstruction of Northern as well as Southern Korea which Senator Flanders has advocated in a most statesmanlike and Christian speech. For we cannot reconstruct territory which is under the military occupation of the Communists.

(4) Finally and most important of all, it would prove to all Asia and to the world that the armies of the United States and those of the other members of the United Nations had won a military victory in Korea. For we would not only have defeated the North Korean Communists, but also driven the Chinese Communists back to where we were at the time they initially attacked. This would cause the Communists to lose a tremendous amount of "face" all over Asia. Their heavy losses of men, running into the hundreds of thousands, would have gone for naught. They would not have driven back the armies of the United States and the United Nations. On the contrary, they, the Chinese, would have been severely punished. This would cause the fence sitters to keep away from the Communists and would lead many within the Communist ranks to desert. In addition to being a military victory for us, it would be a propaganda triumph of the first magnitude. It would be tangible and visible proof that Communist aggression had been punished and that it did not pay.

At the same time, there would be a "buffer" zone between this new line and Manchuria. This would be largely mountainous in character. The Chinese Communists could not therefore pretend that we were threatening their territory. This would deprive them of an argument which they might otherwise continue to use in their efforts to stir up the Chinese both to fear and to hate us. Ultimately, of course, as passions cooled, this territory could be assimilated into a united Korea.

It would, however, be highly desirable that from the very start, we should have the power plants on the Korean side of the Yalu River under United Nations control. This would prevent the Communists from using their ability to shut off the power to coerce or blackmail the people and industries of Korea.

Perhaps we should also take account of the argument that our mission was to repel the effort to change territorial control by force, and therefore that we ourselves must not use force to make a corresponding shift

of the territorial control to the north of the thirty-eighth parallel.

The establishment of a line at the "neck," 100 miles north of the thirty-eighth parallel which I am proposing, does not, however, require the immediate political allocation to South Korea of the strip of territory in the zone between it and the thirty-eighth. This, too, might be made something of a buffer strip, but under the protection of United Nations forces and under temporary United Nations civil supervision. Communist troops should not be allowed in this area. But South Korean troops and our own national forces could even be kept south of the thirty-eighth parallel for a time. But the strategic position would be much stronger for defense against any renewal of aggression at the line I have indicated than at the thirty-eighth parallel. Because of their defiance of United Nations appeals and decisions on the Korean aggression, the Communists can hardly justify a claim that we should now merely restore the condition which existed prior to June 1950 without our imposing any additional safeguards against a renewal of attacks. We cannot turn the clock back to June 24, 1950, in view of all that has happened.

Will the Communists agree to such a proposal? I do not know. But I suggest that it is important to find out, and that, if they refuse, we should most certainly see if the military situation will not permit us to move forward and to drive the Communists back to the neck of Korea.

Perhaps the military situation will not permit us to do this and our very competent generals in the field may feel that a settlement at the thirty-eighth is the best we can do. If so, I shall acquiesce. I have no desire to play military expert at a distance of 10,000 miles with the lives of several hundred thousand men.

But I do feel it proper to express my disquietude at the prospect of using the thirty-eighth parallel as the point of settlement. The policy I have suggested may well cost more in the short run, but I cannot help believing that it will save lives and effort in the long run. In any event, I hope that we and our allies will wake up to the danger of uncritically accepting the thirty-eighth parallel merely because it constitutes the easiest terms upon which an armistice may be arranged and the shooting stopped.

Sincerely,

PAUL H. DOUGLAS.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question is the amendment which was under discussion yesterday, on page 3, beginning in line 24.

Mr. McFARLAND. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Butler, Md.	Ives	Monroney
Byrd	Johnston, S. C.	Neely
Capehart	Kem	Pastore
Carlson	Kerr	Robertson
Cordon	Knowland	Russell
Flanders	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Frear	Lehman	Underwood
Hayden	Magnuson	Wherry
Hill	McCarran	Young
Hunt	McFarland	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The Chief Clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. AIKEN, Mr. CASE, Mr. DWORSHAK, Mr. HENDRICKSON, Mr. KILGORE, Mr. LODGE, Mr. LONG, Mr. SCHOEPEL, and Mr. WILLIAMS answered to their names when called.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is not present.

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

After a little delay, Mr. STENNIS, Mr. WELKER, Mr. O'MAHONEY, Mr. McCLELLAN, and Mr. HENNINGS entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

After a little further delay, Mr. McKELLAR and Mr. ELLENDER entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I wish to say that I have been in the Committee on Appropriations.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator should not—

Mr. McKELLAR. I know it is not permissible under the rules for debate to occur while a quorum is being obtained, but I simply wish to say that we have been in the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I say ditto to that.

After a little further delay, Mr. NIXON, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BRICKER, and Mrs. SMITH of Maine entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

After a little further delay, Mr. BEN-
TON, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. BUTLER of Ne-
braska, Mr. CAIN, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr.
CLEMENTS, Mr. DIRKSEN, Mr. DOUGLAS,
Mr. DUFF, Mr. EASTLAND, Mr. ECTON,
Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. FULBRIGHT, Mr. HOEY, Mr.
HOLLAND, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. JOHNSON
of Colorado, Mr. MALONE, Mr. MCCARTHY,
Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MOODY, Mr. MORSE,
Mr. MUNDT, Mr. O'CONOR, Mr. TAFT, and
Mr. WATKINS entered the Chamber and
answered to their names.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent because of illness.

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] and the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, on yesterday the distinguished Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], addressing himself to the Senate committee amendment to the Interior Department appropriation bill, beginning in line 24, on page 3, and going down to line 22 on page 4, made some observations which I do not believe were pertinent and some statements which, Mr. President, I believe to be in error. Some of the statements made by the distinguished Senator from Nevada were correct, but in my opinion their application is influential in defeating the amendment, rather than in sustaining it.

The Senator from Nevada told us that it was his purpose to put the Southwestern Power Administration on the same basis as the Southeastern Power Administration now is and as the Bonneville Administration now is.

I think the statement with reference to putting the Southwestern Power Administration on the same basis as the Southeastern Power Administration is accurate. I would hope that the statement with reference to putting the Southwestern Power Administration on the same basis as the Bonneville Administration is accurate, but I am convinced that is impossible. I believe those who favor this amendment want to put the Southwestern Power Administration just where the Southeastern Power Administration now is, namely, on a basis where it does not have a single foot of transmission line, where it does not have a single kilowatt of power either to buy or to sell. That is the status of the Southeastern Power Administration, shorn of any responsibility, denied by circumstances and otherwise the opportunity of being an instrumentality of the slightest service to the rural electric cooperatives in that area, or of value to the Government. I think the proponents of this amendment would like to see the Southwestern Power Administration in quite as poverty-stricken a condition, both with reference to opportunity to be of service to the rural electric cooperatives or of value to the Government.

I submit that it would be impossible to put Southwestern Power Administration on the same basis as the Bonneville Administration. As my colleague [Mr. MONRONEY] pointed out last evening, the generation of hydroelectric power in the Southwest and from projects operated in connection with the

Southwestern Power Administration is on such a limited basis that it is impossible to derive from the available projects sufficient electric energy to have a firm flow of power in excess of 18 percent of the time for the market which it seeks to serve, while on the other hand the steady flow of water in the Columbia River makes the hydroelectric power there almost as firm as it would be if it were generated by steam facilities.

The distinguished Senator from Nevada sought to make it plain, as he said, that he was not against the REA program; yet I must remind him that the continuing-fund provision in the statute is in accordance with the REA program. I remind him that it is the REA program. I remind him that the REA cooperatives were the proponents of it. He remembers well the time in 1949 when that amendment was placed in the law. He remembers that the directors of local REA cooperatives from the Southwest came to Washington by scores and by hundreds. He remembers that they petitioned their representatives in the Congress and the committees to provide the continuing-fund feature in order that, from their viewpoint, the program might become workable. We are all aware that the opposition at that time came from the private utilities in the Southwest; and, so far as I know, the only opposition in the Southwest to the program as it is now provided by the law comes from a few of the private utilities, but not all, because, as I said yesterday, the two in Oklahoma are signatory to the contract which was executed by reason of the existence of the continuing-fund provision of the law.

The distinguished Senator from Nevada read into the Record yesterday a statement by a Mr. Gesell, of the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co., which appears at page 7793 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9. Mr. Gesell's statement appears on page 1609 of the Senate committee hearings. He said:

So far as the Oklahoma contract is concerned, it is not essential that the continuing fund exist at all.

I call the attention of the Senate to two facts: First, that Mr. Gesell's company is signatory to the contract which was made by reason of the existence of this provision of the law; second, that that contract was negotiated by Mr. Lane, president of the other great public service corporation in Oklahoma, who has repeatedly recognized and stated that, insofar as the Southwestern Power Administration is concerned, so far as the REA co-ops are concerned, so far as the municipalities seeking power are concerned, and so far as the Government is concerned, the continuing-fund provision is necessary.

I acknowledge that that continuing-fund provision is not necessary for the welfare of the private utilities. I acknowledge that their welfare is not enhanced by the continuing-fund provision. I acknowledge that their profits are not increased by it. Before that provision was written into the law, and before the contract was entered into, which was made possible by the provision, the Oklahoma utilities were buying hydroelectric power at the bus bar.

They were paying about 5 mills for half of it, and about 1½ mills for the remainder of it. Since this contract has been entered into, they pay 6¾ mills per kilowatt hour for the power they buy. Therefore, I acknowledge again that the continuing-fund provision is not necessary for the profit or the position or the welfare of the private utilities.

But let us see, Mr. President, who has profited by reason of the existence of the law. In the first place, the rural electric cooperatives have benefited. They have received an abundant quantity of power, instead of the limited and inadequate quantity they had been receiving. They receive it at a much lower cost than they had been paying. Therefore, the rural electric cooperatives profit by reason of the continuing fund provision in the law and the contract which was made as a result of it. Municipalities in Oklahoma profit. I referred yesterday to the specific case of the small community of Wetumka, which now has an abundant supply of power at a reasonable rate, because of the working of the contract, which was made possible and put into operation following the enactment of the continuing-fund provision.

The Government profits by reason of it. The Government can now sell every kilowatt of power it can generate at any of the hydroelectric projects now in existence in the Southwest, or which may be built, at a price which will bring the Government approximately 6¾ mills per kilowatt-hour, instead of having to continue to sell it at an average of less than 3 mills per kilowatt-hour.

Mr. President, who would lose if this committee amendment were adopted? The first group, which would take a terrific loss, would be the rural electric cooperatives. They would have less power, and they would have to pay more money for it. The same is true of any municipality in Oklahoma which now has or may hope to have a source of power. The third entity which would lose, if this amendment were adopted, would be the United States Government. It would again be faced with the condition of having to sell about half its power as dump power, and the rest of it, at a lower price than they now receive for all of it. Who would profit, if this amendment were adopted? There is only one group which would profit, if the Senate of the United States were to accept this amendment, and that group is the private utilities in the Southwest, two of whom have already acknowledged the equity of the arrangement worked out by reason of the passage of this provision in the law, which it is now sought to repeal.

Without fear of the slightest substantial contradiction, Mr. President, I make the statement that the only ones who can profit from the adoption of the amendment are the private utilities in the Southwest. I make the statement, without the slightest fear of substantial contradiction, that insofar as our part of the country is concerned, the only opposition to the law as it now reads, and the only support for the amendment as offered, comes from a limited number of utilities in the Southwest. I cannot be-

lieve that the United States Senate or the Congress, when fully aware of the uncontested facts, that the REA cooperatives, the municipalities, and the Government must lose by the adoption of the amendment, and that only the utilities can profit by it, will seriously, under those circumstances, consider the adoption of an amendment which could have that result, and only that result.

My distinguished friend from Nevada said:

Very simply stated, the continuing fund of the Southwestern Power Administration has become an issue because the fund, since its use was expanded in the Interior Department appropriation of 1950, has been used as a device through which the Southwestern Power Administration is acquiring facilities.

I submit, Mr. President, that that statement is in error. I submit that the Southwestern Power Administration is neither acquiring facilities by reason of the continuing-fund provision in the law, nor is it able to acquire facilities because of the continuing-fund provision.

Let me tell the Senate what the continuing-fund provision permits. The use of the continuing fund is specifically limited to these three uses: No. 1, to defray emergency expenditures necessary to insure continuity of electric service and continuous operation of facilities. The amendment which Senators seek to have adopted would not permit that.

No. 2, to cover all costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy.

No. 3, to cover all costs in connection with the leasing of facilities, not the acquiring of facilities.

I should like to tell the Senate the only sin the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration has committed, if he has committed any sin. He has entered into certain contracts with rural electric cooperatives whereby he leases their high-voltage transmission lines running from their steam generating plants and over which the power from those plants travels to its ultimate destination.

As a part of that lease provision, Mr. President, the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration has acquired an option to purchase those transmission lines. But there are certain conditions with reference to that option which should be stated. In the first place, the option has been acquired without cost to the Government. In the second place, the option is in favor of or to the benefit of the Government. In other words, after a period of years, I believe 40 years, during which time the rentals paid by the Southwestern Power Administration to the rural electric cooperative have been sufficient to enable the cooperative to pay back to the Rural Electric Administration in Washington all the money borrowed and all the interest required, so that the loan secured from the Government has been fully paid back, at that point the Southwestern Power Administration has an option to acquire the transmission line.

Certain facts, however, stand out in bold relief with reference to that option. In the first place, the Administrator must come to Congress to get an appropriation for even the \$10, if that is the

option price, to acquire the transmission line.

In the second place, the low figure at which he has the option to purchase that transmission line, if Congress by making an appropriation authorizes him to do so, is the result of the fact that he has paid the rural electric cooperatives through the years for the lease of the line a sufficient amount to enable them to pay back to the Government every dollar they borrowed with which they built the line, and the interest on the money, or the unpaid portion of it while it is being repaid to the Government.

It may be that the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration has been too thrifty an agent of the Federal Government to please certain Senators. If the Senate of the United States or the Congress wants to say to him, "You have made too good a deal for the Government; we want you to make a deal of less value to your Government," I say to the Senate that he will comply with that mandate. Apparently, insofar as the Senate is concerned, his efficient service for the Government has been taken as the basis for criticism, and certain Senators now want to cripple his activities because he has done too good a job for the Government. If we want him to be less efficient, and will tell him so, he will comply.

I should think, Mr. President, that instead of seeking to interfere with his work, he should be commended by the Congress for the effectiveness, the efficiency, and the thrift of his operation, rather than to be condemned for it. He has not taken advantage of the rural electric cooperatives. His contract with them makes it possible for them to be in such a condition that they are a good enough risk to enable the REA to make a loan to a cooperative whereby it can build the generating facility. Without the contract with the Administrator, Mr. President, there would be the same situation in Oklahoma which exists in Minnesota, as it was portrayed yesterday by the distinguished Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY].

The rural co-ops in Minnesota have borrowed money and built generating plants. Three of them operate on such a basis that they cannot produce sufficient power to meet the demands made on them. Three of them have a surplus of power, and have to slow down in their operation, which decreases the usefulness of their facility and increases the cost of their product. If they had a line connecting them, and a grid whereby all their power could flow into the same system, the overproduction of the one could be used to supply the demands of the other.

That problem has been eliminated in Oklahoma, Mr. President, by reason of the contract which has been made possible. The Western Electric Co-op began, in 1940, to get the money with which to build their generating plant. Their plans were made and approved. Their application for a loan had been received, accepted, and approved, but the requirements of World War II for critical materials were such that they

were compelled to postpone the building of their plant. So it was deferred for the duration of World War II. Immediately thereafter, the Western Electric Cooperative renewed their effort to secure the loan from the REA with which to build their steam-generating plant to supply an area which was poverty-stricken for power.

When they initiated their application in 1941, the utilities opposed their request for loans, saying, "There is no need for power in that area." Yet today the utilities themselves are building there, or planning to build, a steam-generating plant which will produce either three or four times as much as the plant which the rural electric cooperatives are building; and those who look into the future and judge on the basis of reality know that both plants will not be able to supply the demand in western Oklahoma. So, after the war, the cooperative renewed their application for a loan with which to build the plant. But the cost had gone up; indeed, it had gone up so much that they could not justify the loan on the basis of the output which they would be able to produce and the price they would be able to obtain for it.

Then came the opportunity to make the contract with Southwestern Power, whereby they could sell every kilowatt they could produce operating 24 hours a day, 365 days a year. Then the loan to them became feasible. Then the foundation was laid upon which it was justifiable to make the loan.

So the REA's are profiting by this contract. They seek it. They favor it. They were happy to give the Southwestern Power Administration's Administrator the option after 40 years to acquire the transmission facilities they leased to him on a basis whereby they would be paid enough in rental to repay with interest every dollar of the loan they had made.

So the Administrator thought he was doing a good thing for his Government when he took an option whereby, after the lease money he had been paying was sufficient to retire every loan, with interest, he could acquire the facility for the account of the United States Government for a very modest price. But, as I said a while ago, he could not implement that option, Mr. President, until and unless the Congress authorized it and appropriated the money for it.

So I return, Mr. President, to the statement that the distinguished Senator from Nevada was in error when he said that the continuing fund has become an issue because its use was expanded and it became a device through which the Southwestern Power Administration is acquiring facilities.

I say again to the Senate that if we want to condemn the Administrator for having made so favorable a contract, not for himself, not for the REA, not for the utilities, but for his Government, his principal, then tell him not to continue to make such good contracts any more, and he will not do it. I do not believe Senators, knowing the facts, will condemn an agent of the Government for being frugal and thrifty at the same

time he is being efficient and effective in carrying forward his program.

Mr. President, it would be a tragedy for this amendment to be adopted. It would be a tragedy that would result in a loss to Oklahoma REA's and those in the Southwest generally. It would be a loss to the Government if the amendment were to be adopted. It would be a source of profit only to the private utilities, two of whom in Oklahoma have already signed a contract whereby they put themselves in a position of saying, "We do not want the additional profit which this amendment would give us."

I do not believe the great Senate of the United States will adopt an amendment which would penalize the rural electric cooperatives, which would penalize municipalities now securing this power, or those that could secure it, which would penalize any Government facility that receives it, which would penalize the Government itself in the sale of its power, and which would result in an unasked and unearned profit to the utilities in the Southwest who are neither in position to ask for it nor worthy to receive it.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, it is my intention to make a point of order against the language beginning on page 3, line 24, and lines 1 to 22, inclusive, on page 4, as legislation on an appropriation bill. But I know that that will close the debate, and I should like to inquire whether there are Senators who desire to be heard before making the point of order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I think the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] desires to be heard.

Mr. HAYDEN. Then I withhold the point of order for the moment.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed, without amendment, the following bills of the Senate:

S. 51. An act for the relief of Arthur Henrik Sorensen, Maren Anderson Sorensen, and minor child, Evelyn Sorensen;

S. 124. An act for the relief of Mrs. George (Wong Tze-yen) Poy;

S. 275. An act for the relief of Rafael Kubelik, his wife, Ludmila Kubelik, and their minor son, Martin Kubelik;

S. 417. An act for the relief of Sui Ken Fong and Sui Fong Fong;

S. 536. An act for the relief of the estate of Sidney Lomax, deceased;

S. 631. An act for the relief of Conrad Xavier Charles Maurer;

S. 699. An act for the relief of James M. Shellenberger, Jr., a minor;

S. 879. An act for the relief of Luigi Podesta;

S. 915. An act for the relief of Betty Minoru Kawachi;

S. 1109. An act for the relief of Grady Franklin Welch;

S. 1113. An act for the relief of Philip J. Hincks; and

S. 1438. An act for the relief of Paul D. Banning, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 953) for the relief of Joseph A. Myers, Hazel C. Myers, and Helen Myers.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, before discussing the amendment, I want to read two telegrams into the Record. The first is from Umatilla, Oreg.—quite a way from the Southwestern Power Administration—and the second is from Heppner, Oreg. The first is as follows:

Request your support of original Interior appropriation bill without any amendments. Any other action will be vote against rural electrification. It has demonstrated its worth many times as an investment and no expense to the Government. Please advise us of action you take when this bill comes before the Senate.

The telegram is signed "W. C. Kik, president, Umatilla Electric Cooperative Association."

The second, from Heppner, Oreg., reads as follows:

Regards the Interior amendments which you will soon be asked to vote on. Please support these amendments as it is vital to our existence in obtaining low-cost power. Also please note that in these, you will be voting for or against the rural electrification program. Your support is urgently needed.

Signed "Columbia Basin Electric Cooperative, Inc., Kenneth Smouse, president."

Mr. President, I undertake to say that neither Mr. Kik nor Mr. Smouse had an opportunity to study this bill or its provisions, or any amendments proposed by the committee, or amendments which might be intended to be proposed by Members of the Senate when the bill reached the floor. These are worthy gentlemen. They are very much interested in the rural electrification movement, and properly so. But these two telegrams were sent by them at somebody else's request. I do not believe it would take a Hawkshaw to identify the source of the request, and I suggest that the name might be Clyde Ellis.

In other words, again we are faced with pressure tactics. They are very effective at times. Perhaps they may be this time. Note these statements. It is said that we are voting for or against rural electrification. Nothing in God's wide world is further from the truth. We who have supported appropriations and have worked in subcommittees to attain such appropriations, and who have endeavored to see that the funds were soundly and wisely expended to effectuate rural electrification, find ourselves faced with that kind of ill-advised statement. It is not the judgment of the gentlemen who send the telegrams, but the judgment of someone else.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield at that point?

Mr. CORDON. I am glad to yield.

Mr. KNOWLAND. I merely wish to testify, as a member of the Appropriations Committee who has served on that committee for a number of years, that the senior Senator from Oregon has consistently been a constructive advocate

of rural electrification. He has been mindful of the importance of rural electrification to the Nation as well as to his own State of Oregon; and I know of no Senator on either side of the aisle who has taken greater interest in the constructive development of rural electrification than has the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I very greatly appreciate the statement of the Senator from California. It is seldom that the bouquets arrive while one is still alive.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I received a similar telegram from a local rural electric cooperative. However, I also received another telegram, from a local power company, urging me to take exactly the opposite position. I have strong suspicions that that telegram was also sent by request. So I am wondering if we should not recognize the fact that perhaps there are two pressure groups involved.

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to have had that statement from the Senator from Vermont. He beat me to the punch. I wanted to take up that point as the next step.

Mr. AIKEN. I am sorry if I beat the Senator to the punch.

Mr. CORDON. I am glad the Senator did. I like corroboration before the statement is made.

I have also received the same type of telegram from private utilities which have no interest in that area. Unquestionably the telegrams come from a similar source.

In my opinion, it is the duty of a Member of the United States Senate not to wholly disregard that sort of thing, but to inquire into the soundness of any representations which are made, to attempt to understand any reasoning which may be submitted, and then to use such judgment as God gave him, and that alone, in making his decision. Less than that is less than the duty which a citizen owes his country. Enough with reference to pressure tactics.

With respect to the question of relevancy, I know that a point of order will presently be made, and that once it is made there will be opportunity for debate.

Very frankly, I think there is a grave question involved in the point of order which will be made with respect to the germaneness of this amendment at the place where it appears, and in connection with the particular provision to which it is attached as a proviso.

Mr. President, I know of no tougher question to come to a man who seeks to be wholly fair with himself, and in accordance with the established rules and precedents of the Senate, than a decision of this character. I say very frankly that I favor the amendment, and I hope presently to indicate why I favor it. On the other hand, the question, important as it is, is not of sufficient importance to justify the Senate in overturning precedents with reference to the question of germaneness when

that question reaches the floor of the Senate.

I am of the opinion, after such consideration as I have been able to give to the question, that there is one basis upon which this proviso can be deemed to be a germane amendment. The inclusion by the House of the provision for a continuing emergency fund for the Southeastern Power Administration is in itself notice that that body has adopted, with reference to the administration of the power policies of the United States, a different concept than that which is included in the so-called continuing fund section of the substantive law. That provision came into the substantive law in the same way that this amendment appears in the pending bill, that is, by way of an amendment to an appropriation bill. Both again emphasize the vice of trying to write substantive legislation in an appropriation bill on the floor of the Senate. If we may assume that the House, in writing into this bill the provision with respect to the Southeastern Power Administration, was enunciating the policy of limiting the use of receipts from the sales of federally-produced power to meet emergency needs, repairs, and so forth, to maintain continuity of service—if we may take the position that that is the view of the House, then we have the right to take the position that the House, had it had the opportunity to consider this question with relation to the Southwestern Power Administration, would have taken the same view. However, we are now in the process of determining policy in a place where it should not be determined, namely, in an appropriation bill. Let that be understood.

I believe we can properly say that if we are to pass judgment on the question of the application of Federal money in one section of the United States by amendment, we have the right, as a relevant and germane modification of that statement of policy, to make an application of Federal funds under the same circumstances elsewhere within the United States.

In my opinion, on that basis it is possible properly and legally, and in accordance with the precedents, to determine that the proposed proviso is germane. I myself know of no other basis. For that reason, Mr. President, I wish to support the inclusion of the amendment as a germane proviso.

In presenting my argument I hope I can be entirely frank. I wish to be wholly unbiased. In order that I may present my views on that basis, let me say, first, that I am one Member of the United States Senate who is committed to the proposition that wherever it is possible in the United States we should have private ownership and private incentive and private initiative and private interest. I make that statement at this time because I do not want to be misunderstood, either on the floor of the Senate or in my State.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. For a question.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Yes; for a question with respect to the last statement made

by the Senator. I was wondering how the Senator feels about the public ownership of most of the power resources in the hydroelectric field in his section of the country, and whether he intends to make an effort to return them to private ownership. As I understand, most of the hydroelectric power in the Senator's area is Government owned.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not quite understand the Senator's position. As I understood, he has always promoted that program in his area of the country.

Mr. CORDON. I have always promoted the use of electric energy. The Senator is correct. Sometimes, because there was a dollar or two more appropriated for that purpose, the Senator from Oregon has been accused of promoting it in the West to the detriment of some other part of the United States. Of course, there was no basis for such accusation.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Does the Senator from Oregon see any inconsistency in the statement which he has just made with respect to private ownership and the program which he has so successfully promoted in his State?

Mr. CORDON. I see no inconsistency whatever. I shall now return to my first statement.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. MUNDT. Several of us are not clear whether the Senator referred to the committee amendment or to the Kerr amendment when he stated that he would support the amendment.

Mr. CORDON. I was referring to the committee amendment. Of necessity, in supporting the committee amendment I must vote upon the question of germaneness when that question arises. Therefore I wish first to discuss that question. I want the RECORD to show that on the question of germaneness I shall vote that the amendment is germane, in order that the amendment may remain in the bill and come before us for a vote. When I say "in order," I wish it to be understood that I have first satisfied myself on the question of germaneness.

I now wish to go back to my first statement, namely, that I am one of those Senators who believe in private enterprise. I believe that when my statement is read by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], he will notice a slight qualification. However, in case he should overlook it, I shall phrase it in different words.

I am in favor of private enterprise. Of course, every thinking man recognizes that there are conditions under which the Government, as such, must function, although under different circumstances private enterprise may function. That statement is not an exception to my views. It is only an extension of my views. I recognize, as everyone must recognize who believes in representative government and in the basic concept that governments are established for the benefit of the governed, that all power rests in the people. I believe in the right

of any group of people, however small or however large, among the one-hundred-and-fifty-odd million people who make up the United States, to decide whether they shall have in any particular field, or in any portion of any particular field, private ownership or public ownership. It is a right which rests in the people themselves.

Knowing what the views of a considerable number of people in a given area are, I should be less than honest if I were to deny them the knowledge of my own views. They have a right to know my views. They have a right also to know that when they have decided, in accordance with the processes prescribed by the law, whether they want private or public ownership, I, as their servant, am bound by their views. That is my idea of serving the people who have sent me to the Senate.

Because I take the position I have set forth, I do not wish to stand here as a false champion for either private or public ownership. I want my views in the RECORD.

I am sorry the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] has left the Chamber. He will be able to read the compliment I am about to pay to him. It is a very sincere compliment from the Senator from Oregon to the senior Senator from Oklahoma. I particularly refer to the senior Senator from Oklahoma, rather than including both Senators from Oklahoma, because the senior Senator from Oklahoma today on the floor of the Senate presented the most complete picture of the situation in the Oklahoma area that has ever been presented on the floor of the Senate or before any committee on which I have served. I wish to compliment him on presenting fully to the Senate the situation existing in Oklahoma, the circumstances which gave rise to the situation, and, from his viewpoint, the necessity for maintaining the continuing fund, although in that respect I differ with him.

I am making this statement so that Members of the Senate, if they will read the RECORD, may be fully advised. I suspect that many Members of the Senate will not read the RECORD, and I can understand why that is so. There are too many subjects occupying the attention of Senators at this time for any Senator to cover all the subjects which are presented, either in committee or on the floor of the Senate. Unfortunately we have in the Congress of the United States rather adopted a procedure in legislation of attempting to cover the waterfront, so to speak, at every session. We seem to have the idea that volume is synonymous with quality in legislation, although, unfortunately, that is far from the truth. However, Mr. President, the record is there for those who care to read it.

I cannot agree with the views of the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] either as to the law involved or as to the facts as stated, insofar as those facts were embroidered with the Senator's views as to how they might or might not be changed by reason of this committee amendment, if it is adopted.

Now getting to the meat of the matter, Mr. President, let us examine a thumbnail picture of the obligations of the Federal Government in this field. Public power has now come to mean generally power generated by the Federal Government in excess of its needs. Such power first came into being in a general way as a result of the passage of the 1944 Flood Control Act, which was an omnibus rivers-and-harbors and flood-control authorization act. In it appeared for the first time ambitious projects for both improvement of navigation and flood control, wherein multiple purpose was found in the recommendations, in so far as the construction of dams was concerned. Until that time, dams were built to retain water for the purpose either of aiding navigation or of retarding floods; but with the 1944 act, multiplicity of purpose was written into the law, so that a dam might at one and the same time serve at least three purposes: First, to control flood waters; second, to improve navigation; and, third, to generate power. In many instances there was a fourth purpose, namely, reclamation in the arid areas.

When that bill was under consideration before the then Senate Commerce Committee, for the first time consideration was given to what was to be done by the Government with the power generated at the dams constructed by the Army engineers throughout the country.

There had been exceptions before that time. The Army engineers already had built the Bonneville Dam between the States of Oregon and Washington, and there had been other exceptions; but that was the first time Congress enacted general law on the subject.

In that Flood Control Act, as shown by the hearings, after several rewritings of sundry provisions with respect to the handling of power, the final provision was in substance that the power should be delivered at the bus bar by the Corps of Engineers to the Secretary of the Interior, who became the sales agent, and was directed to sell the power to certain selected customers first, at the lowest rates consistent with good business management; and the Secretary was authorized to construct transmission lines, if necessary, for that purpose. Mr. President, that was, in substance, all the law on the statute books at the time when Mr. Douglas Wright became Administrator of the Southeastern Power Administration.

There have been various interpretations of the meaning of that short provision of the Flood Control Act. I shall not go into that matter. I disagree with many of the interpretations; but so far as this particular matter is affected, when the Southwestern Power Administration became the servicing agent for all of the Corps of Engineers dams in the southwestern area of the United States, a number of problems arose. Included among them was the necessity of connecting the dams, the question of transmitting the energy, and then the all-important question, which every Member of Congress could have known about, had he read and understood the reports which the Corps of Engineers had made on every dam in the multiple-purpose

field in that area they had ever recommended to the Congress in all their history. In every instance they estimated the amount of energy which might be generated at the several dams, and they identified the energy as being of the peaking or variable type which was not satisfactory as a continuous supply of electric current for a continuous demand, or firm energy, for sale generally. That appears in every report; and in every report, when they estimated the amount of energy, they determined its value as peaking power. That was known long before Mr. Wright became Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration as such.

Mr. President, after the Southwestern Power Administration was established, Mr. Wright became the Administrator. He is a competent engineer; he is, from his lights, a faithful and honest servant of the United States. He seeks to do what, in his opinion, is the best thing for the people in the area he serves. He is entitled to have that said of him by me at least on the floor of the Senate. However, when Mr. Wright looked over the series of dams which were coming under his jurisdiction, being a good engineer, and particularly a good electrical engineer, and, I believe, having a passionate belief in public ownership of power—although that is only my belief; he has never said that to me—the thing which first came into the mind of Douglas Wright was that inasmuch as this power was peaking power, the thing for the Government to do would be to build the necessary steam plants in order to get a continuous base for electrical power, and then superimpose the variable power from the dams, and thus obtain not only the greatest value from the peaking power, but also an electrical public-ownership empire, as a result of the establishment of the base of steam-generated power. That plan was presented to the Congress, but the Congress denied the funds with which to do that job. That is one of the most important points before the Senate at this time, namely, that the Congress acted upon the application, and denied it.

Mr. Wright's actions thereafter do not meet with my approval. I believe that the administrator of any law is the executor of a trust. I believe that if any man working for the Government in an executive or administrative position or field desires to change the law, he has the perfect right, and it is his duty, to resign his job and get elected to Congress, and come to Congress, and there seek to change the law in the way the Constitution provides that changes in the law shall be made.

However, Mr. Wright did not do that. Having been directly denied the funds with which to build steam plants and the funds with which to build transmission lines, Mr. Wright, when he was denied that right, turned to a new field. He is ingenious, and he seeks to carry out his convictions. I differ with him only with respect to whether he had the right to act as he did. The Rural Electrification Act was on the statute books. That act made available the credit of the United States to rural cooperatives anywhere in the United States, to assist them in se-

curing something which they all sorely needed, electrical power; something which the private companies could have furnished but did not furnish. I hold no brief for them in their lack of vision and in their failure to discharge what, in my opinion, was their clear duty as a quasi-public organization.

Mr. Wright turned to the Rural Electrification Act. That act provides authority for its Administrator to loan money to rural cooperatives for the purpose of building transmission lines, and so forth, or, in those cases where they cannot secure power at reasonable rates and on an adequate basis, to construct generation facilities. It is a separate act from the Flood Control Act; there is no connection between them.

The Flood Control Act basically is administered by the Corps of Engineers; the power which results from it is administered by the Secretary of the Interior; and the REA is under the Secretary of Agriculture. Mr. Wright was employed by the Interior Department only. He performed his duties well, in my opinion. Of course, he never told me that, but what was accomplished was too well done not to have been performed by a good mind; and he has a good mind. It was perfectly clear that what the Government had denied directly, namely, the money to build steam plants, with about 18,000 miles of transmission lines, and to establish in this field Government ownership in the southwest portion of the United States, might be achieved by indirection; and it was.

How was it achieved? Let us not forget that the only authority of law possessed by Mr. Wright consisted of a few words in the Flood Control Act of 1944. Nevertheless, he worked up with rural electric cooperatives some agreements, by which they would construct the steam plants which the Congress denied him the right to construct, and by which they would construct the net of transmission lines which the Congress had prohibited him from constructing.

But the electric cooperatives had to make a showing, under the law, of feasibility, in order to get that kind of money; because it went into the tens of millions of dollars in the affected areas. Mr. Wright was equal to that necessity. His contract provides that he will, in the case of a steam plant, buy the total output of the steam plant from the cooperative. If the cooperative will construct the transmission lines, then he will lease the transmission lines and that is not a wheeling agreement, by the way. He will lease the transmission lines, and he will guarantee payment for the use of the transmission lines necessary to repay the Federal Government, in the REA division, the total capital outlay, plus interest.

Mr. Wright becomes a guarantor of REA investment; but I do not find any authority for that in the law. Mr. Wright in every instance, wrote into the contract he entered into a provision that the payments were intended to amortize the loan; and, Mr. President, the senior Senator from Oklahoma mentioned that Mr. Wright, being very zealous of the interests of his Government provided that, once these heavy

investments were in effect amortized, the Government would have an option to purchase the plant and lines. According to my understanding, that is true. The senior Senator from Oklahoma said the purchase would be at a very nominal price; so nominal, my understanding is, that it was \$1 or \$10 in each instance, although the facilities might be worth hundreds of thousands or even millions of dollars.

I have no objection to that kind of zeal for the Government, although I should prefer, after facilities were amortized, to leave them still in the ownership of the local people, who themselves were the ones in need, and who would still need the facilities. If there is not to be private ownership, then I want public ownership right down at the grass roots where the people live. Therefore, so far as I am concerned, I would rather, after the loan on the facilities was amortized, if it should be, that they still remain the property of the people whose vision and courage went into their construction in the first place.

I wish to concentrate on one thing, namely, the legal aspects of the problem. In my opinion there was and is no authority justifying Mr. Wright in doing what he sought to do. I am not questioning whether there should be authority. Perhaps what is contemplated is sound, where a majority of people desire this sort of service. If so, let it be done in the proper way. Let it be done by means of a bill which is carefully thought out, which comes before this body and which is explained to the Senate, so that Senators may know what they are doing, and let us not put Doug Wright, seeking in good faith to advance the interests of the people in the area where he serves, in the position of trying to do by indirection what he knew, from the word of the Congress, he had no legal authority to do directly. It is not fair to him.

Where does that bring us with reference to this particular amendment, Mr. President? I think it should be perfectly clear to anyone that when we charge a man with the heavy responsibilities which rest on the shoulders of Douglas Wright, and then circumscribe him with the shackles of the appropriative procedures of the Congress, we almost require him to do a thing which we attempt to prohibit him from doing. He is almost in that paradoxical situation. He is in business, an important business, and the Government is not established to handle that kind of business. Under those circumstances, there are certain naked necessities for variation from the ordinary appropriative procedures and for the ordinary administration of funds which must be adopted if Mr. Wright is to have any chance at all to do his job. One of them is the necessity for meeting emergencies that could not be foreseen when appropriations were made.

The Senator from Oregon was a member of the Appropriations Committee and favored the exception which was granted at the time when Congress, I think in 1949, recognizing this necessity, provided a fund of \$100,000 which should be continuously available to the Administrator of SPA for the purpose of meeting emergency necessities, in order that there

might be no break in the continuity of service to be rendered with respect to the delivery of Federal power.

If my memory now serves me correctly, the next request was for \$300,000. I believe that was only last year. The senior Senator from Oklahoma prepared an amendment, offered it on the Senate floor, and it was adopted. But, Mr. President, when the \$300,000 came into the picture, it was no longer an emergency fund. It was properly denominated a continuing fund, but where it did not fully disclose its purpose was the point at which it was described as a \$300,000 continuing fund.

Mr. President, when we read that particular provision we must reach the conclusion that Congress intended to establish a fund of \$300,000, and that that was the limit of the amount of money which might be spent within any fiscal year. Let me read the provision:

Continuing fund, power transmission facilities: All receipts from the transmission and sale of electric power and energy under the provisions of section 5 of the Flood Control Act of December 22, 1944 * * * generated or purchased in the Southwestern Power area, shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States as miscellaneous receipts—

That is general language. Let us follow this language—

except that the Treasury shall set up and maintain from such receipts a continuing fund of \$300,000, including the sum of \$100,000 in the continuing fund established under the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944 * * * which shall be transferred to the fund hereby established; and said fund of \$300,000 shall be placed to the credit of the Secretary and shall be subject to check by him to defray emergency expenses necessary to insure continuity of electric service and continuous operation of the facilities, and to cover all costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy and rentals for the use of facilities for the transmission and distribution of electric power and energy to public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies.

I undertake to say, Mr. President, that anyone reading that language would reach the conclusion that it provided a fund of \$300,000 for the purposes set forth. As matter of law—and I know that any lawyer worthy of the name will have to agree with the statement—there is no limit upon the amount which can be spent in any period of time under the terms of the amendment except the limit imposed by taking the total amount of funds which have heretofore been and are now being placed in the Treasury of the United States as gross receipts from the whole operation of the Southwestern Power Administration. There is no limit beyond that, and the \$300,000 is, in legal effect, only a prohibition on the Secretary of the Interior against the writing of a single check in excess of \$300,000. That is what it means in law. That is why I think the amendment offered by the Senator from Nevada should be adopted. Under the language of the amendment there is available to Douglas Wright, as the agent of the Secretary of the Interior, every dollar that has ever been paid into the Treasury of the United

States from the Southwestern Power Administration and every dollar that will be paid while this section remains on the statute books.

There is a limit as to what the money may be used for, and that is reasonably clear. It is to "defray emergency expenditures necessary to insure continuity of electric service and the continuous operation of facilities." That is altogether sound. It is to "cover all costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy."

The Flood Control Act of 1944 does not contain expressly or by implication any authority to anyone to purchase any electric power or energy.

There is also reference to "rentals for the use of facilities for the transmission and distribution of electric power and energy to public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies." Those words are window dressing.

Mr. President, we are now at the meat of the proposition. This continuing fund is a blank check in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior for every dollar of receipts that will come to the Southwestern Power Administration from whatever source. Let us see how that affects the fiscal situation of the United States.

It is not a problem of Oklahoma, Mr. President; it is not a problem of southern Missouri; it is not a problem of the Southwest area. It goes to the very heart of the integrity of the Treasury of the United States. It goes to the very heart of the integrity of the Flood-Control Act. Let us remember that when funds go into the Treasury of the United States they, of necessity, go for one of two purposes: They go into the unappropriated funds of the Treasury and become the property of all the people, subject to appropriation, subject to being applied in the general fund of the Treasury, to all bonds and other indebtedness of the United States, or they go into some special, earmarked fund, and as such they are subject to use only for the specific statutory purposes enumerated, and they are not a part of the assets of the United States. They cannot be used to pay the debts of the United States.

I submit, Mr. President, that not one dollar ever paid by the Southwestern Power Administration into the Treasury of the United States can go free into the funds of the United States so long as this language is on the statute books. Every dollar that goes into the Treasury of the United States while this language is in the law as it is today is entitled by that provision, which, apparently, would limit the Secretary to \$300,000, when there is no limitation on the Secretary beyond the limitation that he cannot spend more than \$300,000 by any given check.

Mr. President, there is a series of dams in the Southwest area. Those dams were constructed with the money of the people of the United States. A part of the capital investment is charged off against general benefits of flood control and navigation, and is not repayable. The part that is allocated to investment in power is repayable. There is a charge set up in the Treasury with respect to each of those capital investments, and the reimbursable portion is to be met by the un-

entailed receipts from the power generated at a particular dam, and until that money can come into the Treasury and be offset against that capital investment, the total of the capital investment must remain on the books, with its accruing interest, endlessly.

The only way to stop the interest, the only way to retire the capital investment, the only way the people of the United States can ever know whether they were wise or foolish in making the investment, or that their servants, the Corps of Engineers, did or did not use good judgment when they made their prognosis with reference to future payments and future justifications, is by setting up the receipts from the actual sale of the energy as a credit to offset the capital investment and the continually increasing interest. That cannot be done—and I am as certain of my facts and my law as I am that I am standing on my feet today—so long as there is in existence a contingent or a conditional power which can be called into play—not may be, not will be, but can be. So long as there is a conditional power to draw those funds from the Treasury they cannot become unappropriated funds in the General Treasury subject to offsetting against the capital investment.

This presents the reason why I think we ought to amend the bill. In amending it I do not want to hurt the people of Oklahoma, or the people of Missouri, or people anywhere else. But, Mr. President, I do believe it was unwise in the first place to put the provision in the law. There should have been some limitation so that some part of the funds could have been forever discharged from any contingent liability, so that they could ultimately be used for the purpose for which they were intended to be used, namely, finally to offset the capital investment in the power features of the dams. That cannot be done under the present language of the law.

The Senator from Oklahoma cited the situation he so well knows in his own State of cooperatives having been induced to invest in transmission facilities and in steam-generating plants a very great sum, perhaps millions of dollars; I do not know what the exact amount is. They were induced to do it by reason of a promise by the Southwestern Power Administration to lease the transmission line on the basis of such payments as in effect are 40-year installments on the purchase, or to purchase the power from steam installations on a basis that represents 50-year purchase installment contracts, which is what they really are. Then, with that guaranty, of course the cooperatives could go to the Administrator of REA and get their loans, because the loans in effect would have been guaranteed.

Mr. President, we do not need the kind of language here employed to make that possible, if that is what we want to do. The statement has been made by the two champions of what is suggested, the Senators from Oklahoma, that the power purchased will be purchased for a sum much less than the sum for which it will be sold; that it cannot be stored, that it must be sold, and as we all know, the two operators are almost instantaneously

neous. The Government purchases the power that comes over the transmission line, and sells it, and most of it the Government sells right back to the individuals from whom it was purchased. So they are operations going on coincidentally every minute of the day and night. If the Government is getting more for what it is selling than it is paying for what it is buying, why does it need a blank check on every dollar of receipts from all the dams in the Southwest? There is only one reason why it would be needed, Mr. President, and that is that a bad mistake might be made. The Government might have made a bad contract. Do not forget that these contracts carry minimum payments, and the minimum payments represent the amount that is necessary to amortize the debt in 40 or 50 years in each instance—not the debts of SPA, not the debts of the Federal Government, but the debts of the cooperatives.

The money is not needed, Mr. President, if this is a sound deal. I am not discussing for the moment whether it is legal. I am merely taking the view which I think the people of Oklahoma in the rural areas who need the electricity would take. They want the electricity. They want the power. God bless them, I want them to have it, and I will help them get it and keep it, but I cannot agree that it be done in this way.

Mr. President, we can provide for a fund in any reasonable amount coming from receipts, and I am perfectly willing to have such a provision accepted and written into the bill, or, better still, presented to the appropriate committees. In that event, I say here and now I shall be glad to go before the committee as a proponent, and support the suggestion there, and support it on the floor of the Senate. I do not, however, like that so well; I would prefer to have an appropriation made, because I do not like a revolving fund. I think it is unsound. I know my friend from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] shares with me that basic view, as almost everyone who is familiar with this kind of Federal financing. But because of the business characteristics of this provision, because of the fact that some matters cannot be foreseen, I would be willing in an instance of this kind to permit a fund to be set aside from receipts and made available, but it should be a fund to which there would be a limit in dollars. It should be a fund which would leave free and unentailed the balance of the revenues from these dams and transmission lines.

They must be paid for. I do not believe that anyone would think otherwise. I do not believe that there is anyone who does not want to see these investments as sound investments, repaid to the Federal Treasury, so that the program may move on in the way it should move. But we do not need this kind of a provision to do it. We can adopt a provision which does carry a limitation, and we can set a liberal ceiling, so far as that is concerned. If necessary, we can write the standards under which the money is to be spent.

I undertake to say that for a long time to come Mr. Wright would never draw a nickel out of the continuing fund. He never has yet. He did draw out some \$78,000 from the old \$100,000 fund, at various times, for the purpose for which it was furnished, namely, emergency repairs and the like. But up to date he has never used a dollar of the \$300,000 fund. If there continues to be in this country the kind of expanding electrical market which I believe there will be, he never will have to use it. But every time there is made a contract such as those which have been made, the legality of which is now in dispute in the Federal Court in Missouri, I am advised, we underwrite, with the funds of the Southwestern Power Administration and Interior Department operation, limited only to the sale of power at the Federal dams, the capital investment made by the Department of Agriculture through a Rural Electrification Administration. Mr. President, we cannot find authority for that in this language of the bill. We cannot find it in the Flood Control Act of 1944, or any other Flood Control Act, or any other act or section of an act on the statute books of the United States. The authority is not there.

Mr. President, I regret that this question is before the Senate in connection with this bill. But it is here. I would have preferred to go into it before a regular legislative committee and work out the problem when all the factors could be presented.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. Just a moment.

Mr. President, I do not overlook the fact that some of these contracts were signed, sealed, and delivered before the provision in question went on the statute books in 1950. However, I do not want any more of them made until there is statutory authority, and until sound standards are established to govern them. That is the only reason I support the position which I have described.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Does not the Senator know that the language which it is sought to amend went on the statute books in 1949 and not 1950?

Mr. CORDON. I answer the Senator in this wise: His statement yesterday was that until this amendment went on the statute books, there was no power to do any of the things mentioned.

Mr. KERR. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the language went on the statute books in 1949?

Mr. CORDON. I have answered the Senator. Now I shall continue my statement.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I ask for order.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FREAR in the chair). The Senator from Oregon declines to yield.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, there may be a necessity for a guaranty by the Federal Government of the loans

which it itself makes. But I cannot understand that kind of paradox. If the Federal Government loans the money in the first instance and uses its right hand to do it, if the money is in jeopardy after it is loaned, the mere fact that the left hand of the Federal Government makes a guaranty does not make the job done by the right hand any more secure because the left hand may come over and guarantee the right hand.

If this kind of a guaranty is necessary at all, I cannot understand finance. I cannot understand risk, and I cannot understand the principles of guaranty. If it is a sound loan when it is made, it is a sound loan because of the facts which exist in the area and the market which is there or is to be expected; and the market is no bigger because the Government, through Douglas Wright, steps in and writes a guaranty. There is not a thing in those contracts which cannot be written into a true wheeling contract; and the leasing of lines on an installment basis equivalent to a contract of purchase has not the faintest resemblance to a wheeling contract.

I have heard the statement made here—and it has been made to me in some telegrams and letters which I have received—and if this amendment is adopted there can be no more wheeling contracts.

Mr. President, we must understand the difference between operating leased facilities and entering into a wheeling contract. A wheeling contract is a service contract. The facilities which are used are in the possession of the individual or corporation rendering the service. The operation of leased facilities means that the holder of the lease is, for the term of the lease, in possession, operation, and full control of the facilities. One is a leasing operation and the other a wheeling operation, and they are as far apart as the poles.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield for a question.

Mr. HILL. Is it not true that what happens in the case of a wheeling contract is this: The Southwestern Power Authority, taking its directions from section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, sells the power to the cooperative, or municipality, or other preferred customer; but in order to sell it to the preferred customer, the power must be transmitted. It must be carried to the customer. So the Southwestern Power Administration simply leases the right to make use of the service of the transmission lines to deliver the power to the preferred customer.

Mr. CORDON. That is a lease, and not a wheeling agreement. The same operation might be had under a wheeling contract, in accordance with which the owner of the line continues to operate the line, though he may do so solely as an agent. He takes the Government power in one place and delivers it in another, under the direction of the Government. That is a wheeling contract.

Mr. HILL. But the Government, as the owner or generator of power, must

have a contract to use the transmission line to carry the power to the preferred customer. The Southwestern Power Administration gets its authority to lease, hire, or buy the right to the use of the line, under the authority now in the law to lease.

Mr. CORDON. I believe we have before us a matter which needs a little exploration. I believe it goes to the philosophy of the whole question of public power. I shall explore it slightly. The Flood Control Act of 1944 directed the delivery to the Secretary of the Interior of power from Army engineer dams, period. It did not authorize the Secretary of the Interior to buy or sell any power other than the power resulting from the power installations at Federal dams.

Wheeling contracts—and I speak now of true wheeling contracts—in my opinion are clearly within the meaning and intent of the Flood Control Act, when it says, in connection with the sale of power, that the sale shall be made in such a manner as to promote the widest distribution, at reasonable rates, and so forth. As I understand, it means that the Secretary is entitled to do any and all things which will change the characteristics of the power from interruptable or variable power to demand or firm power, so long as the final result is that the power he sells is the equivalent of the power which the Flood Control Act gives him to sell. When he leaves that concept and takes the new view, that because he is taking power rather than taking power and changing it to the equivalent of demand power and is selling it, he should build, by direction or indirection, all the necessary base under the peak, so as to have for sale not only the power from the dams, but all the firm power below which is necessary to support the use of the peaking power on top; we have a widening of the purpose and intent of the Flood Control Act to the broad aspects of public Federal power at wholesale—and it is only a step from that to retail—in the whole area where we have peaking power. If we are to do that—and I shall not vote to do it—we should do it after very careful consideration and in the full knowledge of the legal effect of what we are doing, and the consequences.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. I should like to ask whether the Secretary of the Interior is not now authorized under the Flood Control Act to distribute and sell, under priorities, the electrical energy which is mentioned in the law and which comes within his jurisdiction.

Mr. CORDON. The Secretary of the Interior is the selling agent for all excess power at all dams operated by the Corps of Army Engineers.

Mr. WHERRY. Does the McCarran amendment in any way nullify any part of such authority?

Mr. CORDON. It does not.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator has already answered the question, but in line with the same thought, is it not a fact that the McCarran amendment does not prohibit the negotiation of wheeling contracts to carry out the purposes of

the Flood Control Act under which the Secretary of the Interior has the right to distribute and dispose of power?

Mr. CORDON. Would the Senator restate his question?

Mr. WHERRY. Does the McCarran amendment in any way prohibit or prevent the making of wheeling contracts to deliver the energy by the Secretary of the Interior under the Flood Control Act?

Mr. CORDON. In my opinion it does not. In my humble opinion, when we grant to the Secretary of the Interior authority to sell the power generated at the dams in such a manner as to promote its greatest usefulness, at reasonable prices and on a business basis, and so forth, there is implied the power to do those things which are necessary to be done to effect that purpose. I do not believe there is implied, however, the additional power to sell more electric energy than is turned over to him by the Corps of Army Engineers.

Mr. WHERRY. Does not the question resolve itself into the situation that wheeling contracts to deliver energy under the Flood Control Act are one thing, but that the leasing of lines is quite another thing?

Mr. CORDON. Yes; and the purchase of steam plants is still another.

Mr. WHERRY. That is what the Senator says is involved in the so-called authority which has been used in connection with the revolving fund, and the McCarran amendment would hold the revolving fund to the purposes for which it was originally established. Is that correct?

Mr. CORDON. That is my understanding. The Senator from Nebraska referred to various steps. Let me say to him that the action of becoming a guarantor of the capital investment in both transmission lines and steam generating equipment is still quite another step. They are all involved.

Mr. WHERRY. The point I believe the membership of the Senate should have clarified is that the McCarran amendment, at least as I interpret it, in no way nullifies or countermands any part of the Secretary's authority to make wheeling agreements.

Mr. CORDON. In my opinion it does not.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. Yes.

Mr. HILL. As I understand the Senator's position it is that the language which authorizes the Secretary of the Interior to transmit and dispose of such power and energy in such a manner as to encourage the most widespread use of it, on a sound business basis, and giving preference to public bodies and co-ops, and so forth, gives him authority, as I understand the Senator's position, to enter into a wheeling contract, which is a contract to make use of somebody else's line to transmit power.

Mr. CORDON. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator think that it also gives him the power, if need be, to lease transmission lines?

Mr. CORDON. In my opinion it gives him power to lease transmission lines so

long as the leasing of the line is for the purpose of disposing of power, and nothing else. I believe he would have that authority. I cannot understand, if we give him the authority to hire someone else to transmit the power why he should not have the authority to lease lines.

Mr. HILL. That is the reason why I asked the question.

Mr. CORDON. I do not believe there can be any question about that.

Mr. HILL. Does the Senator contend that if the Administrator leased the line or had a wheeling contract, he could not send any power over it except the kilowatts of power generated at one of the dams, as provided for in the Flood Control Act?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator's question is one of those ad absurdum questions, which go beyond all reason. In the first place, Mr. President, in the case of wheeling, if the whole line is at the disposal of one person, there can be no power on it except what he puts on it, and he can take nothing off it that he did not put on. If it is a wheeling line in common use, no one else would put a kilowatt on it that could be taken off it by someone else.

Mr. HILL. If the question led to an absurdity it was suggested by the statement of the Senator from Oregon, because he seemed to emphasize the proposition that the Secretary could not dispose of power other than the power which was generated at one of the flood-control dams or reservoirs.

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Alabama did not understand the Senator from Oregon at all. My statement was that the quantum of power available for disposal by the Secretary could not rise above the quantum which was given him to dispose of.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Why was the figure of \$300,000 selected as the dividing line?

Mr. CORDON. I shall never know. It might just as well have been \$1,000,000 or \$30,000, or \$1,000, because it is nothing but a limitation upon the amount of money which can be withdrawn at one time in one operation; that is all it is.

Mr. CASE. Was it sought by that means to measure the amount which might be needed for the purpose of firming power, so the contracts could be satisfied?

Mr. CORDON. In that respect we must, to a very great extent, deal in speculation. The original provision was an emergency-fund provision. The continuing fund was \$100,000. Incidentally, on that basis, a \$100,000 check could be written as often as that much money was available. However, there was a limit on the purposes for which the money could be spent, and in that case it could be spent only for emergency repairs to guarantee the continuity of what they contracted to do, namely, to deliver the power.

In this instance, in addition to the emergency use, it is possible to purchase power and to lease transmission facilities; and in that case the sky is the limit,

because there is no standard by which to judge it.

Mr. CASE. Is it the Senator's opinion that the allowance of \$300,000 for the continuing fund will make it possible for the Power Administration to meet its delivery contracts with the REA's?

Mr. CORDON. In my opinion, it has nothing at all to do with that matter. I do not think this fund is needed at all in any case other than one in which these ultra vires contracts have been attempted to be put into effect; and because the local party contracts in each case, it is in no sense in pari delicto with the Government itself, which knew better. Because of that, it may be altogether right and proper that in some way we attempt to confirm the contracts, so that those who have spent their money, based on their faith that the Government was following the law and had a right to do what it did, may not lose the money they have spent by reason of that faith; and I would protect them to the last ditch.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, although the amendment refers specifically to the Southwestern Power Administration—

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I do not wish to interrupt the Senator, but I had simply answered a question.

Mr. AIKEN. I thought the Senator from Oregon had concluded.

Mr. CORDON. Did the Senator from Vermont wish to ask me to yield?

Mr. AIKEN. No. Mr. President. The Senator from Oregon sat down before I rose to my feet; and then the Senator from South Dakota asked a question, and the Senator from Oregon rose to answer it.

I am willing to wait, if the Senator from Oregon has anything further to say.

Mr. CORDON. If I sat down, I did so in a moment of mental aberration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thought the Senator from Oregon had concluded, because he did sit down.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, in order that the President of the Senate may not find himself in error, as quite clearly the Senator from Vermont has, the Senator from Oregon will now sit down.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I did not intend to preempt the position of the Senator from Oregon in any way.

Although the amendment relates specifically to the Southwestern Power Administration, it has been brought to the point where it goes considerably beyond a matter involving the Southwestern Power Administration alone, because what is determined in the case of this particular area might well apply to any other part of the United States. In fact, as I view the amendment now, it goes beyond the controversy of public power versus private power, and raises the question of whether and to what extent Government should engage in business at all.

Mr. President, it is unfortunate that sometimes we in the Senate are not given an opportunity to choose a moderate course. We find controversy, with those on either side very adamant in their opinions and very unyielding in their methods. We seem to have such a case

before us at this time. On the one hand, we have the power companies of the United States, who undoubtedly would do away with TVA, municipal power plants, the REA, and all public power development, except as they might control the power, at the first opportunity they have. In fact, it appears that they are campaigning toward that end at this very time. On the other hand, we have some of the disciples of public power, so ardent in their views that undoubtedly they would make all the power systems in the United States public if they had their way. Neither one of them is correct.

Mr. President, each of us has to set up his own criterion in deciding how he will vote on the question of whether the Government shall engage in business in any particular form. So far as I am concerned, the criterion which I use in deciding how I shall vote on the matter of Government in business, will the Government by engaging in any operation or business make it possible to expand and make more profitable private industry in general? If the Government does things which private industry is unable to do for itself, and therefore makes it possible for more persons to do more business in private industry, then I think such a program is justifiable.

We have several examples of that, cases in which the Government has gone into business for the general good of private industry and the country as a whole. Probably our first example was the establishment of the public-school system. It was deemed good for the country as a whole to do away with illiteracy by providing for education.

We have the Post Office as one of the oldest examples in the United States of Government in business. The Government set up the postal system because that made it possible for private business to prosper.

We have our great system of highways, which was developed a little later, superseding the system of private toll roads and toll bridges, because as our commerce grew, it was determined that it was better for private industry in general to have the highways and the bridges publicly owned.

We have the development of our harbors by public funds, because it was impossible for the individual shipping interests which use the harbors to develop them by themselves.

More recently we have the development of airports, practically all of which are publicly owned and publicly operated, because obviously it was uneconomical for the airlines to build their own airports and operate them themselves.

So we have those examples of the Government engaging in business and thereby making private industry more profitable and making it possible for more persons to become engaged in private industry.

Within the past 20 years we have seen the development of public power systems, mostly generating plants. These, for the most part, have been developed where the power was an incidental part of a complete Government program, as in the case of the multiple-purpose dams, or of giant developments such as

Hoover Dam, Bonneville, and Grand Coulee, where the cost of the development was so high that no one private concern could engage in it. So, in making up our minds as to how we should vote on this amendment relating specifically to the Southwestern Power Administration, we must decide whether it is in the interest of private industry to permit the Southwestern Power Administration to lease lines and to buy power to firm up its own power so that it may better serve the private industry in that great area.

The Southwestern Power Authority is a good example of public power, an example of Government engaging in business. Other examples are the public power districts of other areas of the country, notably Nebraska. We also have an example of municipal distribution systems scattered throughout the country which are public developments. On the other hand, we have the private utility corporations as perfect examples of private industry. We also have the REA, which serves, I think, 3,000,000 farm homes of this country, as another type of private industry.

The question we have to ask before voting on this amendment is this: If we give the Southwestern Power Administration authority to lease lines or to purchase power in order to firm up its own supply of power, will it better serve its private customers and enhance the private economy of that area as a whole? Or will we, by adopting the McCarran amendment, deny the Southwestern Power Administration the right to buy power and thereby force the sale of that which it now produces to other distributing companies at dump power rates? In this particular case, however, the question, it appears, is not so direct as that. The question, I understand, is whether the amendment itself is germane to the pending bill. So far as I am concerned, it appears that if the Southwestern Power Administration has had the right to lease lines and purchase power over the past 2 years and if contracts under this authority have already been made, then it appears that any proposal to repeal this authority becomes definitely a matter of legislation and is definitely not a matter to be incorporated by way of an amendment into an appropriation bill.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I should like to address two or three questions, if I may, to the Senator from Oregon, if he will indulge me by permitting me to address questions to him. I may say to the Senator from Oregon that I was deeply impressed by his speech, and particularly by two points which he made in it, which I want to be very sure I understand correctly, and which I should like to have further reflected in the Record, so that at least my understanding may appear therein.

In the first place, I understood the Senator from Oregon to say that he objected to the present proposal with reference to the Southwestern Power Administration's operations, in that it permitted, through the use over and over again of this so-called revolving fund, of the use of receipts monthly, and from month to month, up to the amount of

\$300,000; and in that it permitted the expenditure of sums vastly larger than \$300,000, without their having been cleared through Congress, without their having been made the basis of any appropriation, and without their being expended as the result of Congress having authorized such expenditure. Is the Senator from Florida correct in his understanding that that was one of the principal points made by the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator from Florida is entirely correct. The Senator from Oregon endeavored to make himself clear on that proposition; and that is his view. If the Senator from Florida will indulge me, I should like to say that in the ordinary operation of the particular provision of the bill we are considering, and if we utterly forget its legal effect, if we are not willing to apply the rule which I think should always be applied by lawmakers, to test the law by what can be done under it, not by what is expected to be done, I think we could reach the conclusion that the probabilities in this field do not at all approach the possibilities. Very frankly I doubt that, if any sound system of bookkeeping is set-up in the particular area, there would ever be the necessity of the use of \$1. But it could be used; and that is the only point.

I should also like to touch upon one other thing.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should be glad if the Senator would elaborate his answer.

Mr. CORDON. The danger I see in this type of operation lies here in this: I take it that Federal money ought to be in the Federal Treasury, and since every dollar received from the operation of the facilities concerned is Federal money, we can deem it to be money which should be in the Federal Treasury, and if expenditures are to be made from the Federal Treasury, and an application for the amount of money is made to the Congress, then the two Houses of the Congress will have an opportunity to scan carefully the application, and to require such justification as may be deemed necessary. That will be first in committee, and then in the two Houses. Then, at least, the people may know that their representatives, who are not appointed, but who are elected, have passed judgment not only upon the legality of the action, but also upon the advisability of it.

On the other hand, under what is proposed, there is no control by any elected officials of the Federal Government; the contract is made between an appointive administrative agency of the Federal Government and a group who, of course, have the greatest possible interest in the development, naturally, because it is to serve them. There is no check by any elected group of people of the United States with respect to the expenditure of Federal money, if we permit this sort of use of money to guarantee the construction of lines. Remember, it is not to be used to construct lines, it is not to be used to build steam plants, it is to be used to guarantee the payments so the plants can be built.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. CORDON. I am happy to yield, if I may.

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to ask the Senator a question based upon a statement made in the RECORD yesterday by the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], who, I am glad to see, is present in the Chamber at this time. In response to a question addressed to the Senator from Oklahoma by the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], as shown on page 7797 of yesterday's RECORD, the junior Senator from Oklahoma, speaking of the use of this revolving fund, and of the amount of the fund, made this reply:

It would not be turned over more than once a month, at the most.

The Senator from Florida understood that to mean that this \$300,000, if the details of the purchase and sale of power required it under the operation, for monthly bills and the monthly payment of those bills, could be turned over in its entire amount once a month, which would mean an expenditure in the course of a year of \$3,600,000, assuming that the fund could be perfectly used each month; which might not be the case. Assuming, however, that the fund might be so used, is it the point of the Senator from Oregon that through an uncontrolled use of the fund an expenditure of \$3,600,000 a year might be made under the current operations of the Southwestern Power Administration without Congress having authorized any of that expenditure, and without Congress having appropriated any of the \$3,600,000 to be expended during that year?

Mr. CORDON. It is clear from the language of the act which is now on the statute books that the limit upon the amount of money which can be expended is measured by the total amount of money which has been paid into the Federal Treasury through the Southwestern Power Administration. It is not limited to \$3,600,000 or to \$10,000,000, if that much money has been paid in. It is limited, of course, by the use to which the money is to be put. The greatest danger rests in the fact that this almost fantastic possibility would be realized, that there would be contracts continuing on for years and years to which the funds would be pledged, and which would face some future Congress as a very strong and compelling moral obligation, even though perhaps there was no legal obligation.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield in order that I may propound a question to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to yield to the Senator from Nevada for the purpose which he has stated, without my losing the floor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. The more that is paid in by the Southwestern Power Administration the more there is to pay out, and as the fund expands from year to year the amount paid in becomes greater. Is not that true?

Mr. CORDON. The only way to answer that question is to say that the

provision is a blank check against the gross receipts of the Southwestern Power Administration. This is the most extreme situation that could be presented: The Secretary could write checks of \$300,000 as long as the purpose of the expenditure was within the limits of the provision, just as rapidly as each check came in and was cleared, so that the fund would have to be replenished, and the contingent claim for the fund is equal to the total amount of the gross receipts.

Mr. HOLLAND. Is it correct to say that the only limitation upon the operation, under the existing law, is the size of the operation, in dollars and cents, of the Southwestern Power Administration in any given year?

Mr. CORDON. That is correct. Of course, if the operation is in good faith and there is a purchase of electricity, or there is a rental of a line and the line has been used and electricity has been sold, when the sale is made the money goes back to the Treasury subject to the same lien. That is the vice of it.

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will yield further, there is another point in the remarks of the Senator from Oregon which is of particular interest. If the Senator from Florida correctly understood the Senator from Oregon, it was the view of the Senator from Oregon that the matter of enlargement of the public power program by the acquisition and construction of steam-power facilities was a legislative matter, and that in each case it was necessary to be considered in the light of its impact upon the entire program and should be adopted or rejected by the Congress as a legislative matter. Is that understanding correct?

Mr. CORDON. It is correct.

Mr. HOLLAND. In other words, to use the TVA as an illustration rather than the national power venture, the Senator from Oregon means that in the case of the TVA it was entirely proper for the Congress, in connection with the so-called Johnsonville project, to consider the problem as to whether Congress felt that the steam plant, if constructed and added to the power units in the TVA, would be a justifiable addition to the whole program, but that the Johnsonville project was one which could not be determined by anyone other than the Congress. Am I correct in my understanding of the position taken by the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. CORDON. That is my view. The funds used by TVA in the ordinary course of business can be used for business purposes, separate and apart from going back into the Treasury. But there are limitations on the use.

Mr. HOLLAND. Under the Flood Control Act, the Senator from Oregon meant to take the position, and does take the position, does he not, that the enlargement of the program by the acquisition or construction of a steam power plant is always a legislative matter, and that the legislative jurisdiction may not be properly bypassed through such means as are now being used in connection with the Southwestern Power Administration's operations under the current law?

Mr. CORDON. The Senator has made the statement much more clearly than did the Senator from Oregon. That is my view in a nutshell.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I have one more question, if the Senator will yield further. Is it a fair statement of the position of the Senator from Oregon that he feels that the current operation, under which, both as to transmission lines and as to steam power plants, the Southwestern Power Administration is operating under long-term leases which would permit the payment of the entire cost of construction of either the transmission lines or the steam power plants over a period of years, and at the end of the period would make it possible for the Administration to acquire for a nominal amount the transmission lines and the steam power plant, is a patent method of bypassing congressional jurisdiction to determine whether transmission lines and steam power plants should be acquired by the Southwestern Power Administration as an arm of the Federal Government?

Mr. CORDON. That would appear to be perfectly clear. Of course, the Senator is familiar with the rule which the courts have announced time after time, that that which the law prohibits doing directly may not be done by indirection.

Mr. HOLLAND. It is, then, the opinion of the Senator from Oregon, is it not, that, just as the question of the wisdom of establishing the steam plant at Johnsonville or the question of the wisdom of building a transmission line in Montana—

Mr. CORDON. Or in Oregon.

Mr. HOLLAND. Or in Oregon or Montana or Oklahoma or Colorado was a question exclusively addressed to the legislative judgment, discretion, and determination of the Congress, so the acquisition of any steam power plant or any transmission line by the Southwestern Power Administration should be likewise reserved entirely, as a question of jurisdiction, discretion, and judgment, to the legislative authority, namely, the Congress of the United States?

Mr. CORDON. I agree entirely, and I think we are both supported by the Constitution of the United States in that position.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator. I yield now to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida realizes, of course, that when the Southwestern Power Administration, instead of coming to Congress to ask to have a Government-built transmission line, makes a contract for the wheeling of the power generated, that is, contracts with a private utility to carry the power to the cooperative or to the public body to which the Southwestern Power Administration is sending the power, of course the Southwestern Power Administration has to pay, and should properly, pay the private utility for the service rendered?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida well understands that, but the Senator from Florida regards it as at least a very grave question as to whether the Southwestern Power Administration

should charge such a sum as would enable it not only to pay a fair price for the power from time to time, but also to amortize the entire construction cost of the steam power plant or of the transmission line, so that at the end of a stated period of years the cost would be fully paid, and so that as a result of the contract the Southwestern Power Administration, for a nominal consideration, would have the right to claim delivery to it, as its own asset, of the steam power plant or transmission line.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HILL. In one moment.

The Senator from Florida realizes, does he not, that, so far as the facilities which are owned by the Southwestern Power Administration are concerned, the law itself, section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, requires a rate schedule that will include the amortization of the capital investment allocated to power for a reasonable period of years? Certainly there is nothing unsound about that, is there, that there be such a rate charged that the Government will get back the money which it has invested in the dams and power facilities? The Senator certainly has no objection to that, has he?

Mr. HOLLAND. What the Senator from Florida is inclined to object to and on which he is trying to bring the facts out crystal clear for the RECORD, is that the Southwestern Power Administration, rather than the rural electrification cooperatives, which are supposed to be the beneficiary of the power to borrow from the Rural Electrification Administration, is writing into its contracts such a rate that at a given time in the future, by the payment of a merely nominal sum, it, the Southwestern Power Administration, becomes the owner, and is entitled to be the owner, of both the power plant and the transmission lines, and thereby has successfully bypassed the Congress, and has failed to present to the Congress that specific matter for determination, as it did present similar matters to the Eighty-first Congress in connection with the proposed construction of transmission lines in Oklahoma and in Missouri.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question there?

Mr. HILL. I can answer the Senator's question. The senior Senator from Oklahoma, who lives in Oklahoma and who lives with this matter, seems very anxious to answer it, however.

Mr. HOLLAND. I am happy to yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. Does the Senator know that this leasing contract does not affect the ownership of the steam generating plant at all?

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida is not so well acquainted with the details as he would like to be, but he heard his friend from Oklahoma state—unless he wholly misunderstood him—that for the payment, in the case of the transmission line, of the nominal sum of \$10 at the end of a period of years, the Southwestern Power Administration would have the right, under an option which it had written into the contract, to bypass the law and to bypass the submission of this matter to legislative con-

sideration at the hands of the Congress, and to become itself the owner of the transmission lines. That in the case of the power plants the Senator from Florida was following closely his friend the Senator from Oklahoma. He did not hear him say \$10, but he did say "for a minor consideration."

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Florida yield for a correction of the impression he has? The Senator from Oklahoma would like to clear up the question the Senator from Florida has in his mind.

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I wish to say that the leasing contract would not have anything in the world to do with the power plant. It has to do only with the high-voltage transmission line. The contract permits the Southwestern Power Administration to lease this line for the reason that it will be available for the handling of the output from the steam plant which is built by the rural electric cooperative, owned by it, and retained by it, with no provision in the agreement with the Southwestern Power Administration relating to it, or the title to it, or an option with reference to it whatsoever, but only with reference to the high-voltage line which will be used by the Southwestern Power Administration.

The understanding is that the line will be available not only to carry the output of the steam plant, but also to carry the power which the Southwestern Power Administration gets from the hydroelectric project. The lease rental provides for a sufficient payment over the 40-year period to enable the cooperative to meet its commitments to the Rural Electrification Administration for principal and interest until the loan is paid. Then, as I stated, as a measure of thrift, or whatever one may care to call it, there is a provision in the contract that at that time the Southwestern Power Administration has the option to buy the high-voltage transmission line. I think for—

Mr. HOLLAND. For \$10.

Mr. KERR. For \$10. But it cannot do that without coming to the Congress and asking for the authority to do it and the appropriation with which to pay for it.

I should like also to clear up one other point in the Senator's mind.

Mr. HOLLAND. Let the Senator from Florida say briefly what he thinks about the \$10 provision. He does not believe at all that the Southwestern Power Administration would have to come to Congress for a \$10 appropriation. He thinks the \$10 might very easily come out of the pocket of the manager, or any farmer or any citizen who was interested, and that this device represents a bypassing of the will of the Congress. In other words there is an avoidance of a contest in the very field which developed here during the Eighty-first Congress, when, as the Senator from Oklahoma knows, there was very real diversity of opinion here as to the wisdom of the acquisition of certain transmission lines by agencies of the Federal Government. By the device now proposed a complete bypassing is

accomplished, it seems to the Senator from Florida.

It seems likewise to the Senator from Florida that this should not be regarded as merely a thrifty arrangement on the part of the manager of the Southwestern Power Administration. He does not know the manager, and he does not want to deprive him of any credit whatsoever, but it seems to the Senator from Florida that, if the volume of business is such, and the rates charged for handling the business are such, that instead of the REA association which is involved retaining and claiming and continuing to own the transmission line at the end of a period of years, the Southwestern Power Administration instead becomes the owner by the payment of a mere song. Instead of this being a matter of thrift, it would appear that a larger rate has been paid than a rate which was simply sufficient to allow the carrying on of the Southwestern Power Administration's business as such, because somewhere along the line, out of that operation the entire capital cost has been repaid from the operating revenue.

So it seems to the Senator from Florida that there is at least a definite question as to whether this arrangement is thrifty, or is not, instead, at a rate greater than the minimum rate which would be allowed if a mere nonprofit operation of the purchase and sale of power was what was being carried on by the operation of the Southwestern Power Administration.

Mr. KERR. If the Senator from Florida will yield for one further observation, in the first place, there is more than \$10 involved in acquiring title to this facility.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida heard the Senator from Oklahoma state several times on the floor that \$10 was the amount which, when paid at the end of a period of years, would entitle the Southwestern Power Administration to claim and receive title to the transmission lines.

Mr. KERR. Yes; but the Senator from Oklahoma made it very clear that the Administrator had to come to Congress, not only to get the \$10, but to get the authority to acquire the facility. He does not under the present law, nor under the continuing-fund provision, have the authority ever to acquire title to the facility. Nor can he ever acquire it until Congress gives him such authority. I tried to make it clear that when he comes to Congress he must come not only for the \$10, but also for the authority to acquire the facility.

With reference to the amount of the lease charges over the 40 years, which amortize the cost of the facility, I say to the distinguished Senator that that cost must be in the rate. Whoever amortizes the facility, whoever receives the revenue from it, must have an item in the rate which will be sufficient to pay for the power and to amortize the cost of the facility.

In that regard, not only is it done on a basis to which the REA cooperatives are agreeable, but it is done on the basis on which they have sought to have it done, because, by reason of its being done, and

by reason of the high-voltage transmission facility being available not only to handle the output of the steam plant, but also the hydroelectric power, they are assured of a greater supply, an abundant supply of power, and at a far cheaper rate than they have ever yet been able to get, and cheaper than any rate which is available to them at the present time under any other arrangement which is possible to them. Although it is at a lesser rate, and although it is for an abundant supply of power, it is at a rate which permits the inclusion of the amount necessary for the amortization.

Mr. HOLLAND. I thank the Senator from Oklahoma. However, it seems to the Senator from Florida that it is very patent in this whole matter that the rates must be made sufficient to amortize the whole capital cost. If they are so made, it seems to the Senator from Florida that the purpose of the original Federal law is being circumvented if anyone other than the rural electrification association is to have title to this facility, which the members of the association themselves have made possible. The Senator from Florida is not prepared to give his blanket endorsement to any arrangement under which the head of the Federal agency serving many of these associations is permitted to enter into such contracts, said by the Senator from Oklahoma—and undoubtedly believed by him—to be wholly voluntary on the part of the association, but with respect to which the Senator from Florida feels there might frequently be a question as to whether they were voluntary. It is not human nature to expect people to pay for something by rates which they are paying, and then to proceed to hand it over, for a nominal payment of \$10, to an arm of the United States Government when they get through paying for it.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a further observation?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. In the first place, the Senator from Florida says that he does not believe that that provision should be in the contract. I stated a little while ago that the Administrator had said, both publicly and privately, that if the Senate did not want him to have that additional provision in his contract he would gladly eliminate it. Further—

Mr. HOLLAND. If the Senator will permit me to interrupt him right there, I understood the Senator to say that if the Senate had decided that it did not want the Administrator to have a prudent and frugal operation, and would so instruct him, he would abandon this prudent and frugal operation, at the expense of the members of the rural electrification association, and would take that provision out. That is entirely different from the statement—at least, as the Senator from Florida now understands it—which is now advanced by the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I tried to make it perfectly clear that I was speaking for the Administrator in saying that at any time the Senate advised him that it did not

approve of that provision in his contract he would remove it.

Mr. HOLLAND. But the Senator from Oklahoma spoke of it repeatedly as frugal and prudent management. The Senator from Florida does not feel that management is frugal and prudent when it permits the head of a Federal agency in effect to impose rates under which the members pay out the capital cost, through money which they pay from month to month for the power which they use, and then, at the end of a period of years, hand over to an arm of the Federal Government the asset which they have bought with money out of their own pockets. The Senator from Florida does not think that that is frugality. He would use a different word in describing that operation.

Mr. KERR. Regardless of what word the Senator might use to describe it, the sentiment which I expressed remains the same, that the Administrator has stated that if the Senate does not desire that provision in the contract, he will take it out. Furthermore, if the Senator from Florida is curious about what the REA's in the Southwest think about it, let me say that their representatives are sitting in the gallery. They are now in Washington begging every Senator who will listen to them please not to approve this amendment, because if this amendment is adopted it will result in their having less power at a higher rate.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield in a moment.

On that point the Senator from Florida is not at all adamant with respect to public purchase or construction and operation, in proper cases, of steam power plants or transmission lines. For example, the Senator from Florida voted for the Johnsonville steam power plant in the TVA. The Senator from Florida has personally appeared before the Rural Electrification Administrator, in company with his good friend the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], in connection with the granting of a loan for the construction of a steam plant facility which the Senator from Florida believed was completely necessary and completely justified by the purposes of the original REA Act. Originally the plant was intended to be constructed at the gracious city of Andalusia, Ala., but I believe, under later plans, it was placed at some other site.

The Senator from Florida has also appeared before the same REA Administrator in furtherance of a program for the construction of another steam plant in Florida which, by reason of certain concessions made by the commercial power companies in his State, did not prove in the final analysis to be needed. However, the Senator from Florida is inclined unyieldingly to take the position that there is a legislative question which always ought to be addressed to the judgment of the Congress. He does not take that position to the degree that he is not willing to be persuaded by the dulcet tones and the engaging and always pleasing manner of his friend from Oklahoma, but he is rather strongly of

that opinion. The Senator from Florida is bound to feel in this instance that the manipulation—and he does not use that term as indicative of anything fraudulent—of this act under the practices which he has learned largely from the exposition of those practices as given by the Senator from Oklahoma which is now taking place in Oklahoma, is such that the facilities, whether plants or transmission lines, are paid for, and then, at the end of the payment, the right is claimed by an arm of the Government, for a nominal consideration, to have such facilities go to an arm of the Federal Government, the Southwestern Power Administration, instead of to the good people who paid for them.

The Senator from Florida feels that that is questionable from two points of view. First, he fears that the good people who approve that project because they want the power so badly would much rather have the property for themselves when they get through paying for it. It is only human nature for them to feel that way. Secondly, he feels that it is always improper for an administrative agency, having found that it is rather difficult to impress Congress with some of its programs, to go out in the field and bypass the attitude which it has found in Congress, by adopting a contractual practice which accomplishes the purpose which Congress approved reluctantly and only in strong cases.

Therefore, the Senator from Florida, without finding any fault at all with the senior Senator from Oklahoma, his junior colleague, or the citizens of Oklahoma, feels that if the Senate, finds a practice which is bypassing its own jurisdiction and authority, in which it is very heavily divided, because much opinion is found on both sides of the question, and if it likewise finds that a practice is under way which it believes might be used adversely to the interests of the rural people who comprise the memberships of REA associations, it is the duty of the Senate and of Congress to take a position which will prevent an operation which will bring about either of the two results. The Senator from Florida feels those two results are not good results, and he much prefers to have members of the REA associations everywhere in the Nation safeguarded, and to have the jurisdiction and responsibilities of Congress performed right here, rather than by decision of some administrator in the field, who might or might not scrupulously observe the rights of the people who are intended to be the beneficiaries of this Federal program, namely, the rural people who are members of the REA associations.

Mr. CORDON, Mr. HILL, and Mr. KERR addressed the Chair.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, some time ago I promised to yield to the Senator from Oregon. I do so now.

Mr. CORDON. Would the Senator from Florida permit me to make a statement at this time in order that the RECORD may be complete? It is actually in answer to a question which was asked of me by the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR] earlier in the day. I

have before me a record from which I should like to answer the question of the Senator from Oklahoma, if the Senator from Florida will permit me to do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the Senator from Oregon may proceed.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I made the statement that I thought it was timely to adopt the committee amendment in order that there might not be more contracts of this type made before Congress could thoroughly study the subject and reach a sound conclusion. I call attention to the fact that a contract was made before the enactment of the provision giving any authority to make any such contract. I should like to have the RECORD show the figures involved. A contract, which appears in the hearings, was made between the SPA and the Western Electric Cooperative of Oklahoma. It carries the date of the 4th day of August 1949. The \$300,000 continuing fund was provided for by an amendment to the 1950 appropriation bill, which was considered in 1949. The committee recommended that it be not approved. The amendment, with a slight modification, was offered on the floor of the Senate by the Senator from Oklahoma. It was adopted on the floor. The bill containing it was passed by the Senate on August 25, 1949, and it became law on October 12, 1949. The contract was negotiated certainly some time before the bill was signed, and it is a rather long contract. As I have said, it was signed on the 4th day of August 1949. I thank the Senator from Florida.

Mr. HOLLAND. I now yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, of course the Senator from Florida is familiar with the REA Act, and he realizes that the period of amortization under the REA Act is 40 years. The transmission lines which the Senator has been discussing were built by the REA cooperatives, with loans from the REA. The leasing contracts with the Southwestern Power Administration not only provide for a leasing of the lines during the 40-year amortization period, but they also provide that the Southwestern Power Administration shall bear the cost of maintenance, repair, and upkeep of the lines.

The thought was that at the end of 40 long years the Southwestern Power Administration would have put so much into the lines, by way of repair, new material, and labor in maintaining them for that long period, that really and truly they would be, at the end of the 40 years, the property of the Southwestern Power Administration, on the theory that the Southwestern Power Administration had put so much into the lines. That was the reason why both sides, the REA cooperatives and the Southwestern Power Administration, thought it would be equitable to provide for the purchase, if Congress saw fit in its wisdom to authorize a fund to buy the lines. That was the reason for it. There was nothing unusual about the contract. It was just a good business proposition from the standpoint of the REA.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida does not question the good motives of anyone who was involved in the undertaking. However, he does wish to call attention to the fact that if it be true, as has been stated by his good friend from Alabama [Mr. HILL]—and he is certain that his good friend from Alabama believes it to be true or he would not advance the idea—that at the end of a period of years the amount of money put up by the Southwestern Power Administration was sufficient to justify its becoming the owner, the Senator from Florida calls attention to the fact that every dime that was used during that period of years to accomplish that result was Federal money, because that is the only kind of money that the Southwestern Power Administration is able to use.

Therefore, the result would be that through a period of years of payments, chips and whetstones, the Southwestern Power Administration, without specific appropriation and without Congress having passed on the question of the wisdom or unwisdom of construction or acquisition of a transmission line, would have become the owner of that transmission line. Thereby the authority of Congress to hear that specific matter and to pass upon it one way or another would be completely defeated.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to yield in a moment. I should like to continue with my statement. The money which the Senator from Alabama says would have been paid over the years by the Southwestern Power Administration would have been Federal money. Therefore the facility, the Senator from Alabama argues, should become Federal property.

The Senator from Florida calls attention to the fact that all of that operation would have been without the approval of Congress, and it would have bypassed the Congress.

In the second instance, the Senator from Florida calls attention to the fact that there is at least a question as to whether it was all Federal money, because, as the Senator from Florida sees the matter, there is certainly a good probability that much of that money reflects expenditures out of the pockets of the members of the REA's, for whose benefit the loans were made.

The manipulation of the matter, as disclosed here, in that case would result in depriving those REA members, those equitable owners of the property, of their right to the property, and would bring it into Federal hands, again by-passing its submission to the Federal legislative body, the Congress. One or the other must be true.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. HOLLAND. I should like to conclude my discussion of the point. One or the other must be true. Either the money which is paid out for the facilities is Federal money, in which case it has been spent without Federal authorization, and has bypassed congressional authority; or it was local money, belonging to the people who are members of

the REA's. The net result through this contract will be to deprive them of the investment which they made over that long period of years. The Senator from Florida does not wish to be heard supporting either one of those developments, because either one of them, it seems to him, is equally bad. He does not care to be put in the position of approving such a program.

Now I am glad to yield to the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. So far as Federal funds are concerned, they are Federal funds in the sense that a Federal agency is running the power distribution in the area, and the funds come from that agency.

Mr. HOLLAND. In other words, they are Federal funds.

Mr. HILL. Yes; in that sense they are Federal funds.

Mr. HOLLAND. In that case, would not the result of this proposal be to allow the expenditure over a period of years of Federal money and the acquisition by one arm of the Federal Government of a transmission line or a facility which up to this time the Congress has been insisting should come before it for approval or disapproval?

Mr. HILL. Here is what this proposal would amount to: The REA cooperatives would lease the line to the Federal agency, namely, the Southwestern Power Administration. Power would be carried over the line to the REA cooperatives from the Southwestern Power Administration, and the Southwestern Power Administration would pay for the lease; and, in turn, the REA cooperatives would pay for the power they received.

However, the contract went further, and provided that the REA cooperatives, the owners of the line, those who have the fee simple title to it, would not be required to keep it up. Of course, Mr. President, when there is a landlord-tenant relationship, the landlord usually keeps up the property, unless there is a contrary provision in the contract. However, in this case it was provided in the contract that not only would the Government lease the line and furnish the power to the REA cooperatives, but the Government also would maintain the line. It was provided that the lease would be a long one, for 40 or 41 years. By the end of that period, the Government will have put so much into the lines, by way of maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, and upkeep, that the lines probably will have been more or less paid for by the Government. So there was included in the contract a provision to the effect that at the end of the 40-year period the Government would have an option to buy. There is nothing unusual about that.

However, before the Southwestern Power Administration can buy, it must obtain from Congress authority to make the purchase and must obtain from Congress the funds with which to purchase. At the end of 40 years, if the distinguished Senator from Florida is still a Member of the Senate and if I am still a Member of the Senate—and I hope both of us will be Members of the Senate at that time—we shall participate in

the determination by the Senate of whether the Government will exercise its option to buy the line or lines. Before the agency can buy the line or lines, Congress must authorize it and must appropriate the funds needed for that purpose.

There is nothing unusual about this contract, in other words, except that it is for a long period—up to 40 years. We know that often when there is a long contract—one for 40 or 50 years, or perhaps for a longer period of time—there are provisions of this kind. If the tenant is going to put a great deal of money into the repair and upkeep of the property, amounting in many instances to rebuilding the property, the tenant is given an option to purchase the property at the end of the long leasing period.

However, before the purchase can be made in this case, the senior Senator from Florida—who, as I said, I hope will be a Member of the Senate at that time—or whoever then is, in part, representing the State of Florida in the Senate, will have to share in the determination by the Senate of the question of whether the purchase shall be made and whether the funds needed for that purpose shall be appropriated.

Mr. HOLLAND. At least both the Senator from Alabama and I can agree in hoping that we shall be in the Senate at that time.

Mr. HILL. Yes.

Mr. HOLLAND. However, I wish to inquire of the Senator from Alabama whether the provision of the contract actually requires affirmative action by the Federal Government at the end of the period of time. I invite the Senator from Alabama to place that provision of the contract in the RECORD at this point.

Mr. HILL. I do not have a copy of the contract.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I have a copy of the contract, if the Senator will yield to me for that purpose.

Mr. HILL. I have a copy of the law which gives the Southwestern Power Administration authority to construct or acquire lines; and the law says, in part:

The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, from funds appropriated by the Congress, to construct or acquire—

So Congress must pass on this matter; there is no by-passing of Congress in connection with it.

The truth of the matter is, let me say to my friend the Senator from Florida—

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, I invite the Senator from Alabama to place in the RECORD either the entire contract or the portion of it which deals with the option to which reference has been made, because I would be shocked beyond measure if it appears, upon inspection of that provision, that there is a specific requirement that the \$10 cannot be paid unless Congress takes affirmative action at that time.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield, to permit me to read that provision of the contract?

Mr. HOLLAND. I shall be glad to have the Senator place the contract in the RECORD.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Florida yield further to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I wish to say that I can understand the position the Senator from Florida takes in regard to this matter, but I am sure he also sees the other side of the picture.

The chances are that if during the 40-year period the Government, through the Southwestern Power Administration, put thousands or millions of dollars into the upkeep of the transmission lines—

Mr. HOLLAND. If it did, it would be putting Federal money into them.

Mr. HILL. That is right, and that is the very reason why the Government should have the opportunity to purchase at the end of that time.

Mr. HOLLAND. That is the very reason why I think that if there is a prospect of expending millions of dollars of Federal money during that period of time—and that is the figure now used by the Senator from Alabama—the question of whether those millions of dollars of Federal money should be so invested is a proper one for the Congress to determine, not for an Administrator in the field to determine.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Florida yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. Each and every year the Southwestern Power Administration has to come before the subcommittee of the House Committee on Appropriations to have that question considered, and then it is considered by the full House Appropriations Committee, and then by the House of Representatives itself; and, later on, consideration is given to it in the Senate. The question has to come, first, before the subcommittee of the Senate Appropriations Committee, and then before the full Senate Appropriations Committee, and then before the Senate itself. It must also come before the Bureau of the Budget.

However, I say to the Senator from Florida that the question before us now is not one of whether the policy was right or wrong. The dams were built for flood-control purposes, and in that connection certain power was developed. Certainly the Government would not want that power to go to waste. The wise and businesslike thing to do was to sell the power. If the power is to be sold, and is to be sold as the law provides, namely, on a sound and businesslike basis, then the Administration has to have some flexibility of operation, subject always to a check each year by the Congress and by the Bureau of the Budget and by the Comptroller General.

Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further—

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator will examine the Bonneville Power Act, he will see that in that act the broadest kind of power was provided, as was necessary,

so that the Bonneville Power Administration could operate on a sound, businesslike basis.

We cannot sit back and say, "We cannot give this authority or that authority," and then let the taxpayers' property be wasted and not get the best we can from the property. We certainly would not be very good trustees if we proceeded in that way.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the remarks of the Senator from Alabama point up the fact that exactly what should not be accomplished is being accomplished, this property does become the taxpayers' property—the Senator from Alabama has just so referred to it—without having the Congress ever pass upon it.

Mr. President, I ask the Senate to recall—as can very easily be done by all Senators who were in the Senate during the last Congress—that on the specific question of the acquisition or construction of certain transmission lines, this very Southwestern Power Administration came before the Eighty-first Congress and found the Congress to be decidedly divided on the question of the wisdom or unwisdom of each of those programs. Certain of the programs were modified, and they had to be abandoned to that extent. Certain of them were approved by the Congress.

It is evident to the Senator from Florida that this device now being used and now under debate on the floor either is or could easily be a bypass to avoid the submission to Congress of the very debatable question of the wisdom of constructing any particular transmission line. It is so obvious to the Senator from Florida that this is in the nature of a subterfuge, or could be made so, that he does not, by his vote, want to approve its continuance; because it is clear that those supporting the set-up regard it as a matter under which millions of dollars—and I now quote the Senator from Alabama—"of public or Federal money"—and again I quote the Senator from Alabama—"can be expended during the years"—and I am still quoting the Senator from Alabama—"without any authority, by way of appropriation by Congress, and that this property could become Federal property"—and again I quote the Senator from Alabama—"without Congress ever having once been given the chance to decide the wisdom or unwisdom of the acquisition of the particular transmission line."

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, if the Senator from Florida will yield, he misquotes me, if I may say so.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida does not intend to misquote the Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. The Senator from Florida certainly misquotes me when he says that I said that this property by which I take it he means these transmission lines, could become the property of the Federal Government without action on the part of the Congress. I cited to the Senator the very provision of the law which requires approval by the Congress, and the fact that these lines cannot be acquired except by direct appropriation from the Treasury by the Congress.

I should like to say further to the Senator, if I may—

Mr. HOLLAND. But the Senator from Alabama, in his later statement, said that the property of the Federal Government ought to be safeguarded.

Mr. HILL. Yes; and the Senator from Florida knows that these transmission lines today are not the property of the Federal Government. The titles of the transmission lines are in the REA cooperatives, and when I said that the property of the Federal Government ought to be safeguarded, I meant exactly what I said. I referred to property to which the Federal Government holds title in fee simple, namely, the dams and reservoirs which the Government has built, and which the Government, of course, now owns.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida had no expectation of being drawn into an extended debate, but he feels very keenly that there is a question of retention of the jurisdiction and authority of Congress to pass upon substantial investments of public funds; which question is being ignored and bypassed by following the practice which prevails under the current law; a practice which he does not believe is sound. He thinks that that practice is objectionable upon either of two grounds: It may result in mistreatment of the members, themselves, of the rural electrification associations, whose property these transmission lines really ought to be; or it may result in the taking of this action and the commitment of the Federal Government to the expenditure of millions of dollars of Federal money without consideration by Congress, and without appropriation by Congress; and at the end of a few years it may result in having a huge federally owned power-distributing organization in the area which is served by the Southwestern Power Administration, without the Congress having, from this moment on, passed upon the wisdom or the unwisdom of the extension of transmission lines. From both standpoints, the Senator from Florida thinks that such a procedure is unsound and is an abdication of the responsibilities of Congress which cannot be contemplated with any degree of pleasure by the Senator from Florida.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. HOLLAND. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. KERR. I desire to place in the RECORD, with the permission of the Senator, the paragraph from the contract which gives the option to purchase, together with a statement concerning section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, which is the existing law.

Mr. HOLLAND. Would the Senator mind putting the entire contract in the RECORD?

Mr. KERR. I do not have the entire contract; but, if the Senator desires it, I will get a copy of it and give it to him. I am placing in the RECORD that for which he asked, and that is the option provision of the contract. If the Senator wants the entire contract I will secure it and give it to him.

Mr. HOLLAND. I will appreciate that, if the Senator will do so. May I see the paper to which the Senator refers?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oklahoma ask that the paragraph and statement be placed in the RECORD as part of his remarks?

Mr. KERR. I do.

There being no objection, the paragraph from the contract, together with a statement regarding section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

OPTION TO PURCHASE

Grant: The cooperative hereby grants to the Government the exclusive right, at the option of the Government, to purchase the transmission system (a) at any time during the term of this agreement and lease for a sum equal to the principal of the cooperative's REA loan attributable to the transmission system, less the actual amount of the rental payments theretofore made by the Government on account of the principal of the cooperative's REA loan attributable to the transmission system, and (b) upon the expiration of the term of this agreement and lease for the sum of \$10. In the event the Government is in default as to any payments under this agreement at the time it exercises its option hereunder, the Government shall be required to pay all payments in arrears before exercising its option hereunder.

STATEMENT

The funds for the purchase of the transmission lines of the various cooperatives could not be used from the continuing fund but must be approved and appropriated specifically by Congress.

WHY DOES THIS HAVE TO BE DONE?

I have pointed out that the continuing fund does not authorize the construction or purchase of any transmission facilities. The only authority for SPA to construct or acquire transmission lines is contained in section 5 of the Flood Control Act of 1944, which reads as follows: "The Secretary of the Interior is authorized, from funds to be appropriated by the Congress, to construct or acquire, by purchase or other agreement, only such transmission lines and related facilities as may be necessary in order to make the power and energy generated—available in wholesale quantities." Under this authority SPA submits annually to the Congress its estimate for construction. In the event there is a desire to exercise the contract option in cooperative contracts to purchase their transmission facilities, the Administration must include a specific request for funds to do so in its construction appropriation and that request must be specifically approved by the Congress before such purchase may be made.

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I do not wish to detain the Senate further on this subject, except for a few moments, to try to clear up some of the misunderstanding and fear and apprehension which may be in the minds of certain Senators. In the State of Oklahoma we have worked hard to bring about a proper distribution system, and to fulfill our obligations to see that the REA's in the Southwestern area, who have about a quarter of a billion dollars' worth of Government loans, have an opportunity to get the power supply to which the law has for so long said they were entitled.

We have had an uphill fight. First, it was most difficult to try to bring about

a full utilization in our States of wheeling arrangements with the private power companies. Due to the very successful cooperation and support, I might add, of the Texas Power & Light Co., we managed to settle the question in Texas several years ago, and that has been a boon to set the pattern for proper cooperation with private utility companies in wheeling arrangements.

In the State of Oklahoma, those interested worked many years to effect wheeling arrangements. Unfortunately, the private utilities were not as cooperative in trying to work them out as were those in the State of Texas; but finally, with full knowledge and understanding of the negotiations with the REA generating and transmission cooperatives, the two big utilities in Oklahoma entered into what has been hailed as one of the greatest contracts which has ever been signed in the relationship between public power interests and private power interests. The private utilities knew what were the provisions of the contract. They knew also that the REA lines in the State of Oklahoma were destined to reach sections of Oklahoma which they themselves could not reach and render adequate service. Private power lines did not exist on which to wheel sufficient power to reach the sections which constituted a power desert. So they made no objection and did not delay signing the contract, because they knew what was in the picture.

I feel it is rather late, after contracts have been successfully negotiated with the private utilities and with the REA's, to come forward now with an amendment which literally stops this project. I fear it would leave the REA's of the State of Oklahoma and throughout the Southwest, except in the State of Texas, in a very bad state with respect to their electric supply.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished colleague, the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In regard to the last point which the Senator made, were the people of his State given an opportunity to testify before the Appropriations Committee regarding the effect of this amendment?

Mr. MONRONEY. I am glad the Senator has brought that up. This amendment was not in the picture, as I understand, at the time the testimony was taken by the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee. I hope the chairman will correct me if I am in error, but as I understand, the subcommittee which was conducting the hearings did not report this amendment. It never considered the amendment. The amendment was put into the bill by the full Appropriations Committee, without hearings and without testimony.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I wanted to be sure to emphasize that, because it illustrates the evil of changing basic legislation in an appropriation bill. That is the very reason for rule XVI, section 4, particularly the portion with regard to relevancy, being in the Rules and Manual of the United States Senate. It seems to

be a very dangerous thing to do, and to be very unfair to the people of Oklahoma, or to others who may be involved, to come forward with an amendment which, in my opinion, is obviously not germane, an amendment which deals with a fundamental matter which no one who is affected has had an opportunity to consider or discuss, or to present testimony on the merits before the committees. It seems to me to be very bad practice.

I should like to observe, if the Senator from Oklahoma will permit that the idea of making the provision uniform with some provision applying to the Northwest, the great section of the Senator from Oregon, does not at all appeal to me, because the conditions are not uniform. That is absolutely a false analogy. If the rivers of the two sections were of the same character, if the dams in the Southwest were constructed in rivers such as the Columbia River, this question, which is of such great importance to the Senator from Oklahoma and to the people of the Southwest, would not have arisen.

I do not see how such an argument can be made in good faith. It is perfectly proper to have uniformity if it is possible, but the conditions are absolutely different.

Mr. MONRONEY. The conditions surrounding our problem are as different from those in Oregon and Bonneville as the Columbia River and other rivers in those great watersheds in the far West are different from ours.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. If the Senator from Oklahoma will examine the Bonneville Act, he will see that the Bonneville Administration was given, as it should have been given, complete authority to operate that great and remarkable project on the Columbia River on a wise, sound, economic, and businesslike basis. It was given whatever discretion and flexibility were needed for that purpose. I read the act this morning. It was passed by the Seventy-fifth Congress. If there was anything left out of the act that should be in it, heaven knows, I could not see what it was. There was complete authority given to do the job.

As the Senator from Arkansas has suggested, there has not been any hearing on this question. It has not been even considered by the subcommittee. The amendment was offered after the hearings were closed. When the subcommittee reported the bill to the full committee there was inserted an amendment by the full committee to take from the Southwestern Power Administration the authority which it must have in order to operate on a wise and businesslike basis to meet its contracts and to provide benefits to the farmers and public bodies, which Congress, in the Flood Control Act of 1944, has promised and committed itself to provide.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I should like to point out that because of the flexibility

of the Bonneville Act, anticipating conditions which I know must be anticipated by the Senators from Oklahoma, we have gone ahead in the Pacific Northwest and are now 95.9 percent rural-electrified. Without this arrangement I do not think the State of Oklahoma can anticipate the kind of growth to which every State in the Union is entitled and will attain if power is available.

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In regard to the question which disturbed the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], with respect to congressional approval and action, it seems to me the way in which this amendment is injected into the question is something less than congressional approval. It is more like a very clever device to evade any thorough consideration by the Congress of the proposal on its merits. When we examine the provision adopted by the House relating to an entirely different section of the country, the argument that it is germane certainly does not appeal to me at all. I think if the law is changed it should be changed as a result of a regular examination and hearing by the appropriate legislative committee.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida wishes to invite attention at this time to the fact that this specific matter was heard by the subcommittee, and that the record of the hearings, at pages 1609 to 1621, contains the testimony—

Mr. MONRONEY. Will the Senator be good enough to tell us who testified?

Mr. HOLLAND. I notice several names, such as Mr. Gesell.

Mr. MONRONEY. He is vice president of the Oklahoma Gas & Electric Co.

Mr. HOLLAND. The question to which the Senator from Florida is addressing himself is that the matter was heard in public hearings by the subcommittee, and the testimony is set forth in some detail in that portion of the report which is headed "Use of the continuing fund," beginning on page 1609 and going to page 1621, further supplemented by a special showing that at the request of the committee a statement was later filed by one Frank M. Wilkes.

Mr. MONRONEY. He is the head of another utility company.

Mr. HOLLAND. That appears on pages 1941 to 1954, with numerous quotations from numerous other persons. The Senator from Florida did not attend the hearing, but he is sure that no one involved in this debate would want it to appear that there had been no consideration given to the subject.

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly do not want to leave that impression. After those representing the cooperatives had appeared, many weeks later two or three utility officers testified in behalf of killing the continuing fund. I did not want the Record to be erroneous on that point. But so far as the burden of proof is concerned, if this amendment is adopted, the result will be that the testimony of two

or three witnesses will override the testimony of dozens of witnesses who must depend for an adequate power supply on the program which is under way in Oklahoma.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. What I had in mind was that this amendment has no place in an appropriation bill at all. The Senate did not have the issue presented before a legislative committee, hearing witnesses having full knowledge of what was being considered, and having the issue fought out in that manner, primarily because I do not think the issue was properly before the committee. It is true that in the course of the hearings statements were made bearing upon legislation, but I do not think the amendment is properly in the bill, because there is nothing in the bill relating to the Southwestern Power Administration's continuing fund.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. I wish to address a question to the Senator from Arkansas. The matter was properly before the committee, and hearings were held on it. It came over from the House, so we had a right to deal with it as we are now dealing with it and as we always have a right to deal with a measure passed by the House. The legislative provision was originally attached to an appropriation bill by an amendment of the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR]. The senior Senator from Oklahoma dwelt on that yesterday. There can be no question about it.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. The Senator from Florida read rather carefully those portions of the record which were indexed under this particular point, beginning at page 1609 and going to about page 1621, and then beginning again at page 1941 and going through page 1954. It appeared to the Senator from Florida that the committee went into this subject matter from the point of view as to whether the interpretation by the Southwestern Power Administration was at all in accord with the legislative intent. A very strong showing was made, going back to the date of the hearings on the Rural Electrification Act itself, and quoting from the sponsors of that act, from appearances in the various hearings, and in arguments on the floor, quoting from statements made upon the floor at a later date. When this amendment was put in, a strong showing was made, and it seems to the Senator from Florida that the interpretation now being followed in the administration of the act by the Administrator thereof is at variance with what was intended.

That point was particularly studied by the committee, if the record correctly reflects what was done—and I am depending entirely upon the printed record, because I am not a member of the committee and did not attend the hearings—I feel that a strong showing was made

before the committee that there were great departures from the intent of the legislation.

Mr. MONRONEY. But the subcommittee took no action with reference to this amendment. It was put into the bill by the full Appropriations Committee and not by the subcommittee which heard all the testimony.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Was the Senator about to yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. MONRONEY. I still have the floor, and I shall be glad to yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me bring to the Senator's attention a statement in the report of the committee on the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1950, at page 4, which reads as follows:

With further reference to the Southwestern Power Administration, the committee recommends that the paragraph under the heading "Continuing fund, power transmission facilities" be deleted from the bill. This provision proposes to set up and maintain from receipts a continuing fund of \$300,000, including the sum of \$100,000 in the continuing fund established under the Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration in the First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944.

The said "continuing fund" was intended to be used for the "purchase of electric power and energy and rentals for the use of transmission lines and appurtenant facilities of public bodies, cooperatives, and privately-owned companies," and the committee reports that no law exists authorizing appropriations for such purposes.

Then follows the bill with the deletion recommended, and then follows, in the volume I hold in my hand, the amendment of the senior Senator from Oklahoma creating the situation which we are now trying to rectify.

Mr. MONRONEY. Was not that in 1949?

Mr. McCARRAN. That was the appropriation bill for 1950.

Mr. MONRONEY. And the Senate did act in approving the amendment of the senior Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. McCARRAN. It did, and it was legislation. No point was raised against it. We are now trying to rectify the situation. I do not want to take the Senator's time, because I intend to deal with the matter at some length. I would rather have the matter go to a vote and be through with it.

Let me say further that in effect it was said yesterday and today that this is a battle between private power lines and private power concerns, and public power. That is the furthest from being a part of the issue. The issue is: Shall the Congress of the United States assume a responsibility which under the Constitution belongs to the Congress? In other words, shall money, shall public funds, be appropriated out of the Treasury of the United States without consent of Congress? Let us consider the Treasury as we should. Let those who seek money for these purposes come to Congress for an appropriation. That is all there is involved in the amendment.

Mr. MONRONEY. I will say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that it is absolutely necessary every year that the Southwestern Power Administrator come before the Appropriations Committee and lay in full view of the entire committee the complete operation with respect to the continuing fund, for its review and examination. Any time the members of the committee are critical or do not like what is presented to them, or it is found that the Southwestern Power Administration has abused its privilege, it is certainly within the power of the Appropriations Committee to withdraw the continuing fund.

Mr. McCARRAN. Let me call the attention of the Senator from Oklahoma to the fact that under the language of the bill as it was amended, we can do nothing whatever with contracts which have already been made, with agreements which have already been entered into, to the extent that they are now negotiated, to the extent of some \$66,000,000 pledged from the Treasury of the United States for expenditure in the future. The Congress of the United States cannot touch that money.

Mr. MONRONEY. The Congress can touch it if it does not want to go along with the continuing fund.

Mr. McCARRAN. No, it cannot touch it, and in a couple of years it may reach the sum of \$166,000,000.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will my colleague yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. Is it not a fact that every dollar the Southwestern Power Administrator collects is turned into the Treasury of the United States?

Mr. MONRONEY. It is.

Mr. KERR. And is available for appropriation by Congress, and for nothing else, except that, with reference to the continuing fund, each month it can be kept at \$300,000?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield further?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. KERR. I should like to make a brief observation, with the permission of my colleague, if I may receive unanimous consent that he will not thereby lose the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. FEAR in the chair). Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. KERR. Our distinguished friend from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], who is one of the ablest and finest Members of this body is, I believe, under the impression that the Administrator has the authority, under this continuing fund amendment, to take moneys received from the sale of power and spend it in maintaining and replacing and improving the transmission lines which are leased from the Western Electric Cooperative under the provisions of the contract which has been referred to. I should like to call my colleague's attention, as well as the attention of the distinguished Senator from Florida, to the fact that that is not the case; for the Administrator must come to the Congress of the United States, to the Appropriations

Committees of both Houses of the Congress, and receive whatever money he is permitted to use for replacement of equipment, for improvement of equipment, or for anything else with reference to a transmission line, except money which it might be necessary to use in the case of an emergency to enable him to continue the flow of power, because of conditions which might arise by reason of storm or other act of God. Aside from that, every dollar he spends on improvement, repair, upkeep, maintenance or replacement of the transmission line must come to him by positive act of the Congress of the United States after he comes before it and submits his request and makes his presentation, and the committees of the two Houses have heard it and acted on it.

Mr. MONRONEY. And the continuing fund is continually reviewed every year the Administrator comes before the Appropriations Committees.

Mr. KERR. Yes; and it is put into the President's budget. I presume that is in the budget which is before the Congress now. It is referred to the committees of both Houses, and the Administrator undergoes rigid cross-examination when he lays the subject matter on the table. In a few moments I expect to have a delineation of every dollar he has received and every dollar he has spent, and what has been done about the matter since this amendment became the law. I shall place that delineation in the Record in a few moments.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. I note that in the debate of yesterday, as found on page 7797 of the Record, the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma, in response to a question from the distinguished junior Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], made a statement, part of which I shall read, and all of which is available if the Senator wishes it to be inserted in the Record.

He said:

The money can be spent only for the purchase of power or for the lease or rental of facilities. It would not be turned over more than once a month, at the most.

My question to the distinguished junior Senator from Oklahoma is this. Is it the meaning of the statement which he made yesterday in the debate that the turning over of the entire \$300,000 may be accomplished as often as the business of the Southwestern Power Administration requires, but that his judgment is that it would not be more than once a month? Is that the meaning of that statement?

Mr. MONRONEY. No. The question was asked what the maximum possible turnover might ultimately be. Obviously, if the Southwestern Power Administration reaches its goal in the matter of the large number of preferred customers it seeks to serve, it is going to have large bills for firm steam power with both the REA's and with the private utilities. The service charge for wheeling over these private power lines runs a mill and a half, I believe, or a mill and a fourth. The more business that is done, the more

power that is sold, the more turn-over there is going to be in the continuing fund. By the same token, a greater number of dollars are going to be brought into the Treasury as the result. That purchase of power is for the use of the private-power lines for service, or even for the use of the REA transmission lines for service. The more power that is run over them, the more they are used, the more money is going to be earned for the Government. Does that explain to the Senator how the operation works?

Mr. HOLLAND. No; not entirely. Did the Senator mean by his statement yesterday, which I have already quoted from the Record, to say that, if required by the size of the operation, the entire revolving fund of \$300,000 might be turned over once monthly?

Mr. MONRONEY. It could be turned over once monthly if the volume of business warranted the purchase of power, the wheeling of power over private lines, or the purchase of other power from the REA's, or even from other sources.

Mr. HOLLAND. The next question is this: Would it not be true that under such conditions this provision of the law, as now administered, would permit the expenditure by the Southwestern Power Administration as much as \$3,600,000 a year without appropriation by the Congress?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct; because it is a month-to-month, daily business operation, involving power which is being sold, to settle the balances which are due. Any time this fund is improperly used and any time the Appropriations Committee finds that it is not being used for the purpose specified, it can certainly call the Administrator to task and change or further restrict the use of that fund.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, the Senator from Florida is called from the Chamber by circumstances beyond his control. I wonder if his friend [Mr. MONRONEY] will yield for the purpose of his making a brief statement, which will not require more than 2 or 3 minutes.

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HOLLAND. Mr. President, some reference has been made to the attitude of those who take the position which the Senator from Florida is constrained to take in this matter. So far as the Senator from Florida is concerned, consistently throughout all the years since its creation he has been a strong supporter of the REA. As a member of the senate of the State of Florida, he served as floor leader in connection with the act—which was hotly contested—under which the organization of associations in the State of Florida was permitted, in order to operate under the conditions of the REA Act.

Since coming to the Senate he has on many occasions assisted in setting up or enlarging REA activities, and that will always be his position. He supported the Johnsonville steam plant for TVA. He supported the Andalusia steam plant in the State of his good friend the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and the later substitute for that plant.

He has supported, in the case of a group of Florida cooperatives, a strong request for a Florida steam plant known as the Seminole plant, which was found not to be necessary by reason of the concessions later made by the power company. He expects to continue strongly to support this program, but he feels very sincerely—and that is the sole purpose of this statement—that this program could easily get entirely out of hand and become subject to misinterpretation and enlargement by the fiat of administrative regulation and interpretation in the field, in such a way as to take away from Congress its own jurisdiction and responsibilities, not only to the prejudice of Congress and all the people of the United States, but possibly—and the Senator from Florida makes no charge that that is the case in this instance—to the very great injury of members of cooperatives served either by the Southwestern Power Administration or by other Federal agencies in the field.

For that reason the Senator from Florida very strongly feels that the Congress should preserve its own jurisdiction, and that the soundness of this whole program and the degree of confidence in which it is held by the people generally, will be greatly shaken if the idea ever becomes established that administrators in the field can interpret the law in any way they see fit and commit the United States to the making of investments running into many millions of dollars in the purchase of transmission lines or power facilities, without the Congress having devolved upon it the necessity of determining the propriety of the building or acquisition of the particular facilities.

Because the Senator from Florida prizes this program and believes that it has been full of tremendous good for the rural population of the Nation, he wants to keep it, like Caesar's wife, above suspicion. He feels that in just such mistaken friendship, in just such mistaken liberality in the treatment of officials in the field, lies the greatest possibility of destroying the confidence of the people as a whole in this very fine program. For that reason he will certainly insist upon Congress preserving its responsibility, as he feels it should.

I thank the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President—

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I hope the Senator from Oklahoma will not let the statement of the Senator from Florida go unanswered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. To whom does the Senator from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield to my distinguished friend from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, it requires iteration, reiteration, and sometimes additional reiteration; but certainly it has been said time and again by the junior Senator from Oklahoma and the senior Senator from Oklahoma, as well as by the Senator from Alabama, that the Southwestern Power Administration cannot buy lines. It cannot build steam plants. It cannot build reservoirs, or

anything of that kind, without coming to Congress and getting express authority for it. In fact, so far as a steam plant is concerned, it has no authority whatever.

Mr. MONRONEY. It cannot set foot in a steam plant.

Mr. HILL. As the Senator from Oklahoma has said, the only thing the continuing fund can be used for is to meet an emergency such as a terrible flood or storm, or something of that kind, which blows down power lines or impairs or destroys portions of the power facilities. It can be used to carry out a wheeling agreement, to lease a transmission line, or to buy power from a private power company or from an REA, to firm up otherwise secondary or dump power, which would be sold at a give-away price, so to speak.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Possibly the Senator from Alabama has implied the answer to the question I was about to ask the Senator from Oklahoma. However, I should like to ask the question and let the Senator from Oklahoma answer it in his own way.

I should like to ask a question with respect to a statement which is found on page 7995 of the Record of yesterday. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] quoted a statement which was made by Representative Whittington before the House Appropriations Committee in connection with the Interior Department appropriation bill for 1947. As the Senator from Oklahoma knows, Mr. Whittington was chairman of the Committee on Flood Control in the House of Representatives, which had a large part to play in writing the Flood Control Act of 1944, including the paragraph which relates to disposal of power. Mr. Whittington is quoted as having said before the committee:

I thought it was unwise, and it was not our intention, to give the Secretary of the Interior power to construct transmission lines and other related facilities from the income of the power sale, but to require him to come to Congress for the funds for the construction of transmission lines and other of the facilities.

It may be that the Senator from Alabama stated that the money, which would be available for the replenishment of the \$300,000 fund, would not be available for the construction of transmission lines; but is that not a part of the whole proposal before us? Does not the use of the revolving fund to purchase power under contract from associations of cooperatives, when the contract provides for the ultimate transfer of such lines to the Department of the Interior, indirectly provide for the acquisition of transmission lines from the proceeds of power sales?

Mr. MONRONEY. I certainly cannot see that it does, because the cooperatives were organized long before Mr. Wright came to the State of Oklahoma as Administrator of the Southwestern Power Administration. These plans were in the mill long before that. In trying to develop an integrated system of rural cooperative supply the South-

western Power Administration did step into the picture, and has integrated the REA cooperatives. In that way they will receive the benefit of the hydroelectric power, and they will maintain their own steam plants. But by having contracts with Mr. Wright's organization, the Southwestern Power Administration, they can operate them for 20 hours a day, or 24 hours a day, instead of 12 or 14 hours a day. They can make a much better showing of low-cost generation than they possibly could without contracts for the sale of the power, and without contracts for the use of their lines.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Then, is the Senator from Oklahoma in harmony with the interpretation of the intent of the law as stated by Mr. Whittington, that the Secretary of the Interior should come to Congress for the funds for construction of transmission lines?

Mr. MONRONEY. The Secretary does come to Congress now. There is some money provided in this bill for that purpose. The money has been provided for that purpose in other bills. The Secretary must come to Congress to get the money to build the lines. But that is not true with respect to the REA's. In the law which Congress enacted 2 years ago we specifically gave the Secretary the right not only to buy steam-generated power, but to lease lines and facilities. The Senate passed it, and it became a part of the law.

Mr. CASE. Can the Senator from Oklahoma state, if he knows, whether a contract between the Southwestern Power Administration and the western cooperatives provides for the ultimate transfer to the Southwestern Power Administration of transmission lines?

Mr. MONRONEY. It provides that the Government has an option under which it can buy them, if Congress approves at any time during the lease contract. The Southwestern Power Administration cannot acquire and they cannot buy any lines they lease unless and until Congress specifically acts to authorize them to do it.

Mr. CASE. Do they acquire any rights in connection with the payment of sums of money out of the \$300,000 fund to acquire electric energy?

Mr. MONRONEY. No. Does the Senator have reference to generating plants?

Mr. CASE. I have reference to acquisition.

Mr. MONRONEY. No; because the plants are solely in the hands of the REA. Much has been said about vast amounts of power. It should be borne in mind that the total capacity is 115,000 kilowatts. That is the total amount involved in the contracts. There are seven REA generating and transmission cooperatives, and only four of the seven generate power.

One generates 30,000 kilowatts, another generates 15,000 kilowatts, another generates 40,000 kilowatts, and the Western Electric cooperative generates 30,000 kilowatts, a total of 115,000 kilo-

watts. The Western Electric cooperative is today putting in a 150,000 kilowatt plant. We are not talking about big figures.

It should also be borne in mind that the Southwestern Power Administration, because of its contracts with the cooperatives, within 4 years, after the construction has been seasoned and the load built up, will sell them about twice as much power as they buy from it now.

Actually, the load which will be furnished by the cooperatives is a very small proportion, but their plants are well placed with respect to where the need exists, particularly in Missouri and other places, where there is a real need for power.

Mr. CASE. Any expenditure for development from the \$300,000 continuing fund would be solely for the purchase of current, if the Senator understands me, not for acquisition or any right of acquisition?

Mr. MONRONEY. There is no right of acquisition whatsoever so far as steam plants are concerned. The right to an option to purchase the lines is provided, if Congress should give its consent.

I should like to say one more thing in conclusion, and then I shall yield the floor to the chairman of the subcommittee. If we pull the rug from under this whole operation of wheeling contracts with private utilities, and contracts with REA's, into which they have entered in good faith, and not provide anything in the bill to take its place, we will be in a state of confusion, and without any funds and without any method of operating. The pending amendment, which was hurriedly put into the bill at the last meeting of the Committee on Appropriations, would certainly destroy the chances of our farmers, to which they have looked forward for so long, to have a low-cost and a dependable source of power.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MONRONEY. I yield.

Mr. HILL. The farmers in the Senator's State would have no money with which to pay private power companies with which the Administration has signed such contract, because they would not carry power free and could not be expected to carry power free.

Mr. MONRONEY. Yet the policy of Congress, as set forth in the bill, is to try to encourage the signing of new contracts with private utilities. How will it be possible to do so? There would be no authority granted to the Secretary of the Interior to enter into any contracts.

Mr. HILL. No funds would be provided with which to pay for the services?

Mr. MONRONEY. That is correct.

Mr. HILL. I hope the Senator will emphasize in one word how much it is to the interest of the Government and to the taxpayers, who have to put up the money to pay for the flood-control dams, to be able to buy the private power in order to firm up the secondary or dump power. The Government can get much more for the power, if it is firmed up by purchasing power from the private utilities or cooperatives and selling it as firm power, than it would be possible to get if

the Government were forced to sell the power as dump power.

Mr. MONRONEY. The difference is the difference between 1½ mills and 5.6 mills.

Mr. HILL. About four times as much?

Mr. MONRONEY. Yes; if we dump the power without making it available to the people who are ready and willing to use it, someone else will deliver it to them, and the people will have to pay 5.6 mills, 7 mills, or even 8 mills. Therefore, it is to the benefit of the Government, as well as the people, to maintain the arrangement.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I make a point of order that the proviso of the committee amendment, beginning with the word "Provided" in line 24 on page 3, down to and including the word "facilities", in line 22 on page 4 is legislation on an appropriation bill, and, therefore, is not in order.

Under the heading "Continuing fund" the words beginning in line 6, at page 4, down to and including the word "facilities", in line 22 on page 4, are a repetition of the language of the existing law. However, there are omitted from the existing law—and that is how it becomes legislation—the words:

And to cover all costs in connection with the purchase of electric power and energy and rental for the use of facilities for the transmission and distribution of electric power and energy to public bodies, cooperatives, and privately owned companies.

I therefore make the point of order that the amendment proposes legislation on an appropriation bill and is not in order under the rule.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The Chair wishes to confer with the Parliamentarian.

Mr. CASE. While the Chair is conferring with the Parliamentarian, will the Senator from Arizona yield for a question?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. CASE. In other words, the point made by the Senator from Arizona is that since the amendment omits a portion of the existing law it is an amendment of the existing law.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair that the position taken by the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] is correct, namely, that the amendment is general legislation, and therefore is not in order on that ground.

Mr. HAYDEN. I understand that the Senator from Nevada desires to make a point of order that, notwithstanding the point of order which I have made, the amendment may be germane to language already in the bill. At his request, therefore, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, before a quorum call is had, may I inquire as to the reasoning of the distinguished Senator from Arizona on his point of order? As I understand, he makes the point of order on the ground that a portion of the language in the so-called McCarran amendment changes existing law.

Mr. HAYDEN. It does.

Mr. WHERRY. Which existing law was passed prior to this session of Congress?

Mr. HAYDEN. Yes.

Mr. WHERRY. On that basis the Senator feels that his point of order should be sustained?

Mr. HAYDEN. The point of order has been sustained by the Chair.

Mr. WHERRY. Will the Senator from Arizona restate what he said a moment ago with reference to the position of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], as I understand, contends that because there is in the bill a legislative provision, adopted by the House, relating to the Southeastern Power Administration, the subject matter of which is a continuing fund, it would be in order and germane to amend the language and change the law relating to the Southwestern Power Administration.

As I pointed out the other day, my judgment is that they are two separate substantive propositions. The question of germaneness must be passed upon by the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. May I ask the distinguished occupant of the chair whether he made his ruling with the full knowledge of the statement now made by the Senator from Arizona relative to the observations of the Senator from Nevada, that there is in the bill language relating to the Southeastern Power Administration which is now sought to be applied to the Southwestern Power Administration?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HUNT in the chair). The Chair had no alternative; he was placed in a position in which he could make no other ruling.

Mr. WHERRY. In other words, that point had come to the knowledge of the distinguished occupant of the chair when he made the ruling.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hendrickson	McKellar
Benton	Hennings	Millikin
Bricker	Hill	Monroney
Bridges	Hoey	Moody
Butler, Md.	Holland	Morse
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Mundt
Cain	Hunt	Neely
Capehart	Ives	Nixon
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	O'Connor
Case	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Clements	Kem	Robertson
Connally	Kerr	Russell
Cordon	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Lehman	Stennis
Eastland	Lodge	Taft
Eaton	Long	Underwood
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Welker
Flanders	McCarran	Wherry
Frear	McCarthy	Williams
Fulbright	McClellan	Young
Hayden	McFarland	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum is present.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, I fear that inadvertently a mistake has been made, and I desire to correct it. When this matter was discussed in committee, I had understood that it was merely a question of whether the language proposed by the committee amendment was germane to the provision which the House placed in the bill with respect to the Southeastern Power Administration. I inquired of the Parliamentarian as to how to proceed. His directive was to make the point of order that it was legislation on an appropriation bill; which I did. It seems, now, that when I made the point of order, the next move should have been, before the Chair ruled, for the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN] to say, "Yes, but it is germane to the provision which the House incorporated in the bill." That is a question, not debatable, to be passed upon by the Senate. Not realizing that the Senator from Nevada had to be present and on his feet at that instant, to take that action, I hope the Chair will rescind his ruling, and that we may start all over again.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the circumstances, the Chair believes he would be justified in rescinding his previous ruling and in view of the understanding which was had, in giving the opportunity to the Senator from Nevada, to make his motion now.

Mr. HAYDEN. I renew the point of order, that the amendment is legislation on an appropriation bill.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arizona withhold making the point of order so that I may submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HAYDEN. What is the request?

Mr. KERR. I had intended to place in the RECORD a brief statement with reference to certain facts, which statement is still in the process of preparation by the office of the Secretary of the Interior. I had underestimated the brevity of the Senate, and therefore thought I would have plenty of time. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to place the statement in the RECORD at this point, prior to the making of the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement, in a letter from the Secretary of the Interior, is as follows:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., July 10, 1951.

MY DEAR SENATOR KERR: In response to your telephone request, I am happy to supply you with information as to the revenues, and the continuing fund available to Southwestern Power Administration. From fiscal year 1944 through fiscal year 1949 the continuing fund available to SPA amounted to \$100,000. In the appropriation act for fiscal year 1950 this fund was increased to \$300,000. During this entire period the total expenditures from the fund have amounted to \$78,165. That amount was expended in fiscal year 1949 in order to insure continuity of service. No money has as yet been expended from this fund for the purchase of power or costs in connection with the leases of transmission facilities.

The following table shows the actual and estimated figures by years from 1949 to 1953,

inclusive, for gross revenues and expenditures from the continuing fund:

Fiscal year	Revenue	Continuing fund expenditure
1949	\$1,540,089	\$78,765
1950	1,627,807	0
1951 (estimated)	2,280,000	0
1952 (estimated)	2,388,000	198,000
1953 (estimated)	6,700,000	2,800,000

You will note that we expect to receive a total revenue of \$2,280,000 in the current fiscal year without the use of the continuing fund. It is anticipated that in fiscal year 1952 the continuing fund will have to provide \$198,000 for the purchase of power and service charges under the Oklahoma contract with private utilities. In fiscal year 1953 the continuing fund will have to supply a total of \$2,800,000 for the purchase of power and service charges under the Oklahoma contract and the purchase of power and lease of facilities under the contracts with generation and transmission cooperatives. By that time the gross sales by Southwestern Power Administration will have increased to \$6,700,000.

You will note from these few statistics how important the continuing fund is to the successful operation of the Oklahoma contract which was executed by this Department last year and which became effective after confirmation and approval of the rate schedules therein in February of this year. If these wheeling type contracts in which the Congress has expressed such great interest are to be successful, the continuing fund for SPA must remain in force and effect as it is written in the Interior Department Appropriation Act for the fiscal year 1950.

All revenues since the initial service from the Norfolk and Denison project in 1944 have been deposited in miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury except the \$300,000 which is now in the continuing fund. All except this amount are subject to appropriation by Congress.

Regarding your further inquiry as to the contract said to have been executed on August 4, 1949 with Western Electric Cooperative, Inc., records show that a contract was executed with that organization on January 3, 1949, and one on lease of lines on March 24, 1950, but do not show any on the date stated. Our authority for these two contracts was for the first our basic law, and for the second the Kerr amendment, which was enacted several months earlier.

Sincerely yours,

OSCAR L. CHAPMAN,
Secretary of the Interior.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair desires to state that the point of order has already been made. The Chair simply rescinded his ruling. The point of order was not withdrawn. The Chair now recognizes the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, conceding that it is legislation, the amendment is germane, and I therefore make the point of order that it is germane.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair, under the Senate rules, now submits to the Senate the question raised by the Senator from Nevada, namely, Is the amendment germane or relevant to the subject matter of the House bill? The Chair understands that the question is not debatable. The Chair wishes to confer with the Parliamentarian.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state the inquiry.

Mr. KERR. Is the question of germaneness automatically subject to a yea-and-nay vote?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is not debatable. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that there is no mandatory provision for a yea-and-nay vote.

Mr. KERR. I ask for a yea-and-nay vote.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CASE. Under the rule, may an amendment be considered, if it is held to be legislation? Would it not automatically fall from the bill?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is advised by the Parliamentarian that such is not the case. The Chair asked the same question of the Parliamentarian a few moments ago. The Parliamentarian advises the Chair, now, that if the amendment is held to be germane, then it will be open to further amendment.

Mr. CASE. It is in order, notwithstanding the fact that it is legislation. Is that correct?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The previous occupant of the chair has advised the Chair that the ruling on the point of order was rescinded by the occupant of the chair, and that the yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. McCARRAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Hendrickson	McKellar
Benton	Hennings	Millikin
Bricker	Hill	Monroney
Bridges	Hoey	Moody
Butler, Md.	Holland	Morse
Butler, Nebr.	Humphrey	Mundt
Cain	Hunt	Neely
Capehart	Ives	Nixon
Carlson	Johnson, Colo.	O'Connor
Case	Johnson, Tex.	O'Mahoney
Chavez	Johnston, S. C.	Pastore
Clements	Kem	Robertson
Connally	Kerr	Russell
Cordon	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Dirksen	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Lehman	Stennis
Eastland	Lodge	Taft
Eaton	Long	Underwood
Ellender	Magnuson	Watkins
Ferguson	Malone	Welker
Flanders	McCarran	Wherry
Frear	McCarthy	Williams
Fulbright	McClellan	Young
Hayden	McFarland	

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

During the absence of the present Presiding Officer a point of order was raised against the pending amendment on the ground that it was general legislation on an appropriation bill. The temporary occupant of the chair sustained the point of order, which decision he later rescinded, because, under the rules, although an amendment which is legislation on an appropriation bill may therefore be out of order, if it is germane to some legislative provision in the bill

itself, the question of its germaneness must be passed on by the Senate, without debate. That is now the question before the Senate. Is the pending amendment germane?

On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the Secretary will call the roll. Senators who think the amendment is germane will vote "yea"; those who think it is not germane will vote "nay."

The Chief Clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If he were present he would vote "yea"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay."

Mr. STENNIS (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If he were present he would vote "yea"; if I were permitted to vote, I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. MAYBANK] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent because of illness.

I announce that on this vote the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] has a general pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired with the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea."

I announce also that if present and voting, the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has a general pair on this vote with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON].

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and that pair has been announced previously.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation.

On this vote the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], who is detained on official business, is paired with the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from Pennsylvania would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 42, nays 30, as follows:

YEAS—42

Bricker	Flanders	McKellar
Bridges	Hendrickson	Millikin
Butler, Md.	Hoe	Mundt
Cain	Holland	Nixon
Capehart	Ives	O'Connor
Carlson	Kem	Robertson
Case	Kilgore	Schoeppel
Cordon	Knowland	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Lodge	Smith, N. C.
Dworshak	Long	Taft
Eastland	Malone	Watkins
Eaton	McCarran	Welker
Ellender	McCarthy	Wherry
Ferguson	McClellan	Williams

NAYS—30

Alken	Hill	McFarland
Benton	Eumphyrey	Monroney
Chavez	Hunt	Moody
Clements	Johnson, Colo.	Morse
Connally	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Douglas	Johnston, S. C.	O'Mahoney
Frear	Kerr	Pastore
Fulbright	Langer	Russell
Hayden	Lehman	Underwood
Hennings	Magnuson	Young

NOT VOTING—24

Anderson	Green	Saltonstall
Bennett	Hickenlooper	Smathers
Brewster	Jenner	Smith, N. J.
Butler, Nebr.	Kefauver	Sparkman
Byrd	Martin	Stennis
Duff	Maybank	Thye
George	McMahon	Tobey
Gillette	Murray	Wiley

So the Senate decided that the amendment was germane.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment beginning in line 24, on page 3, to and including line 22 on page 4.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

AMENDMENT OF UNITED STATES CODE RELATING TO PROCEDURE IN CONDEMNATION PROCEEDINGS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the leaders on both sides, and of the senior Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN]. There is on the calendar a joint resolution, Senate Joint Resolution 82, Calendar 475, to amend title 28 of the United States Code so as to add thereto a chapter relating to procedure in condemnation proceedings. That measure was reported from the Committee on the Judiciary. Under the law as it now stands the Judicial Conference of the Federal courts submits to the Congress on or before a certain date each year any change it may propose in the rules of the Federal courts. Unless the joint resolution dealing with the change of rules submitted to us by the Chief Justice, who, as chairman of the Judicial Conference, submits the proposed changes in the rules, is acted upon by the Congress before the end of July, and the proposed change is either modified or altered, it becomes the rule of the court. The joint resolution is now on the calendar. I fear that something may arise by reason of which the Senate will be deprived of the right to vote on this very important change in the rules.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that at this time the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside, and that Senate Joint Resolution 82 be taken up for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the distinguished Senator if, in case the joint resolution is not passed, the proposed rule would not change the procedure so that in condemnation proceedings owners of property would be deprived of the right of trial by jury?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, that is exactly the matter that was presented to the Congress. It has been considered by the Committee on the Judiciary and the measure is now on the Senate calendar.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, further reserving the right to object, I should like to state that we discussed this matter in the policy committee of the majority. We decided that it was an important subject, and I hope there will be no objection to consideration and passage of the joint resolution immediately. If there is one thing that is important to our country, it is that the right of trial by jury be preserved. Even though we have now before us for consideration an important appropriation bill, I am of the opinion that it should be temporarily laid aside and that we should proceed to consider the joint resolution, so as to preserve the right of trial by jury in condemnation cases.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The CHIEF CLERK. A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 82) to amend title 28 of the

United States Code so as to add thereto a chapter relating to procedure in condemnation proceedings.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada that the appropriation bill, which is the unfinished business, be temporarily laid aside, and that the Senate proceed to consider the joint resolution?

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection if the distinguished Senator from Nevada will amend his unanimous-consent request so that the joint resolution be made the order of business for 12 o'clock noon tomorrow. It is now after 5 o'clock. It seems to me that, as soon as possible, we should proceed to vote on the committee amendment to the appropriation bill, which was being considered when the Senator from Nevada made his request.

I think each and every Senator ought to have the time from now until noon tomorrow to look into the joint resolution referred to by the Senator from Nevada. Personally, I wish to commend the Senator from Nevada for endeavoring to have it considered by the Senate. But I believe that between now and tomorrow noon Members of the Senate should be given an opportunity to read and study the joint resolution, even though it may be simple in its terms. I shall not object if it is made the special order of business of the Senate for tomorrow noon.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have no objection to that. I simply thought that because of the fact that there are now so many Members present on the floor we would be justified in having immediate consideration of the joint resolution. I should like to have as many Members as possible on the Senate floor when the joint resolution is considered, because it is a highly important matter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada amend his request?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I suggest that there are quite a number of Members of the Senate present now on the floor. The subject matter of the joint resolution could be discussed with the understanding that it would then go over until tomorrow, when there could be a limitation of debate of 30 minutes, if that would be agreeable to the Members of the Senate.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, I have no objection so far as I am personally concerned. I believe the Members of the minority in the Senate will agree with me that we can make the joint resolution the pending business now, and, if Senators desire, discuss it now, but that when the Senate convenes tomorrow, 1 hour be allotted for discussion of the joint resolution, 30 minutes to each side, and then that a vote be taken on it.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President—
The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada modify his request in the manner suggested?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am glad to modify my request. The only

reason I wished to have the joint resolution taken up at this time was that we now have a splendid attendance on the floor, and I should like to make an explanation of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I think it is very important that we proceed with the consideration of the proposed change in the rules of Federal court procedure tomorrow at noon. I think it is of fundamental importance that we preserve the jury system in passing upon exactly such questions as condemnation proceedings. I think it would be a great mistake to limit debate on a principle so fundamental as that. Therefore, while I have no objection to considering the joint resolution at noon tomorrow, I do object to any limitation of debate on the issue.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The objection goes to the whole request.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Nevada modify his request, so as to provide that the joint resolution be made the order of business tomorrow at noon?

Mr. McCARRAN. Very well. Would it be agreeable to explain the joint resolution now, which would probably take 7 or 8 minutes? Then Senators will have my explanation to consider overnight.

The VICE PRESIDENT. First, is there objection to making Senate Joint Resolution 82 the pending business beginning at 12 o'clock tomorrow? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The Senator from Nevada may proceed.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is an original joint resolution intended to establish a uniform system of procedure in the trial of condemnation proceedings.

By the Rules Act of 1934, the Supreme Court was given authority to promulgate uniform rules of civil procedure which should have the force and effect of law. Originally, the Supreme Court was required to make its report through the Attorney General at the beginning of a session, and the rules so adopted and reported by the Supreme Court were to become effective only upon the expiration of one full session of the Congress. An amendment to the Rules Act in the Eighty-first Congress provided that the promulgated rule might be reported directly to the Congress on or before May 1 of any year, and that the rule would then become effective 90 days after its submission to the Congress.

On the 1st day of May, 1951, the Supreme Court submitted to the Congress a rule designated as rule 71A, to govern proceedings in condemnation cases. This rule will therefore become effective August 1 unless the Congress by statute provides otherwise in advance of that date.

A study of this rule indicated to the committee that while the rule as a whole is meritorious, one feature of it is objectionable. This feature is found in

section (h) of the rule, which in effect gives the court in condemnation proceedings the authority to determine whether or not a jury should be used in such cases. The committee is of the opinion that such broad delegation of authority over trial by jury should not be permitted. At the present time, in 41 States, a litigant may have a jury trial of the issue of reasonable compensation, in a condemnation case. This new rule promulgated by the Supreme Court would take away that right and permit a Federal court in its discretion to have the issue of just compensation determined by a commission appointed by the court. This is the provision which, the committee has voted unanimously, should be rejected.

The committee, however, desired to carry out the intention of the Supreme Court insofar as it was compatible with the views of the Congress. The committee was informed and believes that Congress lacks power to disapprove the new rule in part, but should disapprove it completely, or not at all. The committee has therefore reported this original joint resolution which disapproves the rule as promulgated by the Supreme Court in toto; but in this same joint resolution the committee proposes to enact all of the rule as promulgated by the Supreme Court except that portion of section (h) which was deemed to be objectionable.

Section (h) as it now appears in Senate Joint Resolution 82 conforms with the views of the Advisory Committee to the Supreme Court, as expressed at its meeting in 1948, and conforms also with the expressed position of the Department of Justice, as set forth in the supplemental report of the Advisory Committee to the Supreme Court in House Document 121, Eighty-second Congress.

The Judiciary Committee is of the opinion that there should be a uniform Federal rule of procedure relative to condemnation cases, and believes that the procedure set forth in Senate Joint Resolution 82, which provides for trial before a jury, if demanded by either party, or before the court, is a good and satisfactory rule. The committee therefore recommends that the joint resolution be considered favorably.

It should be stressed that this rule, as promulgated by the Supreme Court, will become effective August 1 unless both Houses of Congress and the President take action prior to that date to approve legislation specifically directing that the rule shall not become effective. If Congress should approve such a resolution in its simplest form, the Supreme Court would be unable to promulgate an amended rule for submission to Congress until next year, since such a rule may not be submitted after May 1 of any year. That is why the committee has brought out a resolution which not only in terms rejects the whole rule as issued by the Supreme Court but which also would enact all of the rule except the one portion which has been found objectionable, namely, the portion eliminating the right to a jury trial of the issue of just compensation.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Am I to understand that the rule as promulgated will go into effect unless the Congress acts?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And that the rule, as promulgated, would leave it to the discretion of the trial court as to whether or not a jury should pass on the issue of compensation?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In effect, that amounts to the denial of a jury trial.

Mr. McCARRAN. It could amount to that.

Mr. McCLELLAN. It would amount to it if the court exercised that discretion.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. As I understand, it is proposed to enact, by a joint resolution, all of the rule which is not objectionable. As I understand, this is the only part of the rule which is objectionable.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The joint resolution would compel the court to grant a jury trial if either party demanded it.

Mr. McCARRAN. The joint resolution would leave the situation as it is. At the present time either party may demand a jury trial.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Either party now may demand a jury trial.

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct.

Mr. McCLELLAN. And the court has no jurisdiction in the matter, but is compelled to grant the request.

Mr. McCARRAN. The Senator is correct.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield so that I may suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wonder if the Senator from Michigan will withhold his suggestion of the absence of a quorum so that I may ask the Senator from Nevada a couple of questions in connection with his explanation.

Mr. FERGUSON. I withhold it for a question.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield for a question?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. Can the Senator from Nevada advise the Senate whether up to this time any other rule has been promulgated by the Supreme Court which sought to grant discretion to a trial judge to waive a jury in the trial of any issue before the court?

Mr. McCARRAN. I have none in mind at this time. I do not think there has been. I am quite certain there has not been ever since I have been on the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MORSE. Am I correct in my understanding that in the opinion of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary this would create the first precedent by which a rule would be promulgated giving a trial court discretion to waive a jury trial?

Mr. McCARRAN. Of which I have any knowledge.

Mr. MORSE. Does the Senator from Nevada agree with me that the establishment of such a precedent should be more carefully scrutinized by this body, because it might be the beginning of the undermining of the whole jury system in American jurisprudence, which some forces in this country would seem to like to undermine?

Mr. McCARRAN. That was exactly the thought which impelled the Judiciary Committee unanimously to report the joint resolution to the Senate.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Perhaps it is an antiquated document, and perhaps few people ever refer to it, but I wish to read amendment VII to the Constitution of the United States for general information:

In suits at common law, where the value in controversy shall exceed \$20, the right of trial by jury shall be preserved, and no fact tried by jury, shall be otherwise reexamined in any court of the United States, than according to the rules of the common law.

Mr. President, to my mind, such a rule would be an absolute violation of that provision of the Constitution. All of us held up our hands to Almighty God and swore that we would protect and defend the Constitution.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Nevada yield for that purpose?

Mr. McCARRAN. Yes.

Mr. FERGUSON. What is the pending question? Is it not the vote on the McCarran amendment, which has been declared to be germane?

Mr. McCARRAN. That is correct. I have asked unanimous consent that I may make a 4- or 5-minute explanation, so that the explanation could be before the Members of the Senate overnight and could be considered tomorrow when a vote would be taken on the joint resolution.

Mr. FERGUSON. I withdraw my request for a quorum call, in view of the fact that I now know what the pending question is. I believe we should vote on the McCarran amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No suggestion of the absence of a quorum is before the Senate, because the Senator from Nevada had the floor and he had not yielded to the Senator from Michigan for that purpose.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I yield the floor, because the Senate has agreed to do what I requested.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment beginning in line 24 at page 3 of the bill.

Several Senators requested the yeas and nays, and they were ordered.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll, and Mr. AIKEN voted in the negative when his name was called.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator will state it.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Will the Chair state whether the Senate is voting on the amendment to the committee amendment or on the committee amendment itself.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There was no amendment to the committee amendment. The amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma was an amendment to the bill. The question now is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The legislative clerk resumed the call of the roll.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL]. If he were present and voting he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I withhold my vote.

Mr. STENNIS (when his name was called). On this vote I have a pair with the senior Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD]. If he were present and voting, he would vote "yea." If I were permitted to vote I would vote "nay." I therefore withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senators from Virginia [Mr. BYRD and Mr. ROBERTSON], the Senator from Delaware [Mr. FREAR], the Senators from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON and Mr. MAYBANK], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. O'CONOR] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GREEN], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY] is absent by leave of the Senate on official business, having been appointed a representative of our Government to attend the International Labor Conference being held in Geneva, Switzerland.

The Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS] is absent because of illness.

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON] has a general pair with the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER].

I announce further that on this vote the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON] is paired with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Mexico would vote "nay," and the Senator from Virginia would vote "yea."

I announce also that if present and voting, the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BENTON], the Senator from Ten-

nessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. JOHNSTON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN] would vote "nay."

Mr. WHERRY. I announce that the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], who is absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations, has a general pair on this vote with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McMAHON].

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. WILEY] are absent by leave of the Senate on official business of the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER] and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] are necessarily absent. The Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] is paired on this vote with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] and that pair has been announced previously.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE] is absent on official business.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] is absent on official business of the Committee on Crime Investigation.

On this vote the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY]. If present and voting, the Senator from New Jersey would vote "yea" and the Senator from New Hampshire would vote "nay."

The result was announced—yeas 39, nays 29, as follows:

YEAS—39

Bricker	Ferguson	McCarthy
Bridges	Flanders	McClellan
Butler, Md.	Hendrickson	McKellar
Cain	Hoey	Millikin
Capehart	Holland	Nixon
Carlson	Ives	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kem	Smith, Maine
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, N. C.
Duff	Knowland	Taft
Dworshak	Lodge	Watkins
Eastland	Long	Welker
Eaton	Malone	Wherry
Ellender	McCarran	Williams

NAYS—29

Aiken	Humphrey	Moody
Case	Hunt	Morse
Chavez	Johnson, Colo.	Mundt
Clements	Johnson, Tex.	Neely
Connally	Kerr	O'Mahoney
Douglas	Langer	Pastore
Fulbright	Lehman	Russell
Hayden	Magnuson	Underwood
Hennings	McFarland	Young
Hill	Monroney	

NOT VOTING—23

Anderson	Hickenlooper	Saltonstall
Bennett	Jenner	Smathers
Benton	Johnson, S. C.	Smith, N. J.
Brewster	Kefauver	Sparkman
Butler, Nebr.	Martin	Stennis
Byrd	Maybank	Thye
Frear	McMahon	Tobey
George	Murray	Wiley
Gillette	O'Connor	
Green	Robertson	

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. McFARLAND obtained the floor.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield? I wish to place a matter in the RECORD.

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield to my colleague for that purpose.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the amendment on which the Senate has just voted concludes all reference in the bill to the Southeastern Power Administration. On yesterday a request was made to have included in the RECORD a copy of the negotiated contract between the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics, at Langley Field, and the Virginia Electric & Power Co. I have a copy of the contract, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the contract was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NEGOTIATED ELECTRIC SERVICE CONTRACT NO. NAW-6078 DATED APRIL 30, 1951, BETWEEN UNITED STATES OF AMERICA (NATIONAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS, LANGLEY FIELD, VA.) AND VIRGINIA ELECTRIC & POWER CO.

Premises to be served: Langley Field, Va. County: Elizabeth City. State: Virginia.

Contractor: Virginia Electric & Power Co., Richmond, Va.

Premises are Government owned.

Connection charge: None.

Bills will be rendered to officer in charge of this contract at National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

Payments will be made by United States regional disbursing officer at Richmond, Va.

This negotiated contract is made pursuant to the provisions of section 2 (c) (10) of the Armed Services Procurement Act of 1947 (Public Law 413, 80th Cong.).

THE NACA NEGOTIATED ELECTRIC SERVICE CONTRACT

This contract, entered into as of April 30, 1951, by and between the United States of America, hereinafter called the Government, represented by the contracting officer executing this contract, and the Virginia Electric & Power Co., whose address is Richmond, Va., hereinafter called the contractor, witnesseth that the parties hereto do mutually agree as follows:

1. SCOPE AND TERM OF CONTRACT

(a) Subject to the terms and conditions hereinafter set forth, the contractor shall sell and deliver to the Government and the Government shall purchase and receive from the contractor electric service (hereinafter called service) requested by the Government from the contractor at the premises to be served hereunder (hereinafter called the service location), all in accordance with electric service specifications attached hereto and made a part hereof.

(b) (i) Except as provided in paragraph 1, (b) (iii) hereof, the date of initial delivery hereunder shall be the date upon which contractor completes the installation of facilities described in paragraphs 5 and 10 of Electric Service Specifications attached hereto and is prepared to deliver 70,000 kilowatts on-peak and 150,000 kilowatts off-peak to Government at Langley Field and Government is prepared to take delivery of these amounts of service. The parties hereto will make every reasonable effort to be prepared to deliver and to take delivery of these amounts of service on or before January 1, 1953; however, in no event shall the effective date hereof be more than 6 months after January 1, 1953, or more than 6 months after the date on which contractor is prepared to deliver the above amounts of service whichever is later.

(ii) The term of this contract will be for the remaining portion of the Government's fiscal year and will be renewed for a period of 10 years, subject to the appropriation of

necessary funds. The contract will be renewed yearly thereafter until and unless terminated by the Government giving not less than 60 days' written notice of termination. However, in order that Government may receive any benefits that might accrue from the purchase of its service requirements from Buggs Island project, Government, at any time during the term of this contract, may cease obtaining its service requirements from contractor provided Government obtains its service requirements for Langley Field from Southeastern Power Administration by wheeling power from the Buggs Island project through contractor's facilities, including those provided hereunder, under the terms of any agreement which contractor may make with Southeastern Power Administration for wheeling such power.

(iii) Notwithstanding anything to the contrary in this contract and exhibits, upon completion of the second transmission line from contractor's Chesterfield station to Langley Field, which is expected to be completed in January or February of 1952, contractor will make available to Government hereunder 50,000 kilowatts at unity power factor during the on-peak hours and 75,000 kilowatts at unity power factor during the off-peak hours. In the event Government elects to take delivery of service hereunder after this second transmission line between contractor's Chesterfield station and Langley Field is completed the charges will be based on a contract demand of 50,000 kilowatts until the delivery and receipt of service commences under paragraph 1 (b) (1) hereof.

(c) (i) For and in consideration of the faithful performance of the stipulations of this contract, the contractor shall be paid by the designated disbursing office or officer for service herein contracted for, at the rates and under the terms and conditions herein set forth; provided, that the Government shall be liable for the minimum monthly charge specified in this contract commencing with the billing period in which service is initially furnished thereto and continuing until this contract is terminated, except that the minimum monthly charge specified in this contract shall be equitably prorated for the billing period in which commencement and termination of this contract shall become effective.

(ii) The contractor hereby declares that rate schedules available hereunder are not in excess of the lowest rate schedules now available to any prospective customer, under like conditions of service, and agrees that during the life of this contract Government shall continue to have available the lowest available rate for similar conditions of service.

(iii) Recognition is given to the fact that the Government fiscal year ends on June 30. Payments hereunder shall be contingent upon the availability of appropriations therefor, and shall not be made in advance of service rendered.

(iv) All bills for service shall be paid without penalty or interest and the Government shall be entitled to any discounts customarily applicable to payment of bills by all customers of the contractor.

(v) Invoices for service rendered hereunder shall contain statements of the meter readings at the beginning of the billing period, meter constants, consumption during the billing period and such other pertinent data as shall be required by the Government.

2. TECHNICAL PROVISIONS

(a) Measurement of service: (i) All service furnished by the contractor shall be measured by suitable metering equipment of standard manufacture, to be furnished, installed, maintained, calibrated and read by the contractor at its expense. When more than a single meter is installed at the service location, the readings thereof shall be billed conjunctively. In the event any meter fails

to register or registers incorrectly the service furnished therethrough, the parties shall agree upon the length of the period during which such meter failed to register or registered incorrectly and the quantity of service delivered therethrough during such period and, upon agreement, an appropriate adjustment based thereon shall be made in the Government's bills. For the purpose of the preceding sentence, any meter which registers not more than 2 percent slow or fast shall be deemed correct.

(ii) Contractor, as far as possible, shall read all meters on the last regular working day of the month. All billings based on meter readings of less than 26 days or more than 35 days shall be prorated accordingly.

(b) Meter test: The contractor, at its expense, shall periodically inspect and test the meters installed by it at intervals not exceeding 1 year. At the written request of the contracting officer the contractor shall make additional tests of any or all of such meters in the presence of Government representatives. The cost of such additional tests shall be borne by the Government if the percentage of error is found to be not more than 2 percent slow or fast. No meter shall be placed in service or allowed to remain in service which has an error in registration in excess of 2 percent under normal operating conditions.

(c) Change in volume or character: Reasonable notice shall, so far as possible, be given by the contracting officer to the contractor respecting any material changes proposed in the volume or characteristics of the utility service required at each location.

(d) Continuity of service and consumption: (i) The contractor shall use reasonable diligence to provide a regular and uninterrupted supply of service at the service location, but shall not be liable for damages, breach of contract or otherwise to the Government for failure, suspension, diminution or other variations of service occasioned by or in consequence of any cause beyond the control of the contractor, including but not limited to acts of God or of the public enemy, fires, floods, earthquakes, or other catastrophes, strikes, or failure or breakdown of transmission or other facilities: *Provided*, That when any such failure, suspension, diminution, or variation of service shall aggregate more than 10 hours during any billing period hereunder, an equitable adjustment shall be made in the monthly rates specified in this contract (including the minimum monthly charge).

(ii) In the event the Government is unable to operate the service location in whole or in part for any cause beyond its control, including but not limited to acts of God or of the public enemy, fires, floods, earthquakes, or other catastrophes, or strikes, an equitable adjustment shall be made in the monthly rates specified in this contract (including the minimum monthly charge) if the period during which the Government is unable to operate such service location in whole or in part shall exceed 15 days during any billing period hereunder.

3. RATES AND CHARGES

(a) For all service furnished under this contract to the service location the Government shall pay the contractor at the rate schedule, exhibit A, attached hereto and made a part of this contract.

(b) For purposes of charges under paragraph (a) of this clause any demands due to faulty operation of, or excessive or fluctuating pressure on, the contractor's system shall not be included as part of the Government's demand.

4. CONTRACTOR'S FACILITIES

(a) The contractor, at his expense, shall furnish, install, operate, and maintain all facilities required to furnish service hereunder and to measure such service as of the

point of delivery specified in the service specification. Title to all such facilities shall be and remain in the contractor, and the contractor shall be responsible for all loss of or damage to such facilities.

(b) The Government hereby grants to the contractor, free of any rental or similar charge, but subject to the limitations specified in this contract, a revocable permit to enter the service location for any proper purpose under this contract, including use of the site or sites agreed upon by the parties hereto for the installation, operation, and maintenance of the facilities of the contractor required to be located upon Government premises, all of which facilities shall be and remain the sole property of the contractor and shall, at all times during the life of this contract, be operated and maintained by the contractor at its expense; and all taxes and other charges in connection therewith, together with all liability arising out of the negligence of the contractor in the construction, operation, or maintenance of such facilities shall be assumed by the contractor. Authorized representatives of the contractor will be allowed access to the facilities of the contractor at suitable times to perform the obligations of the contractor with respect to such facilities. Such facilities shall be removed and Government premises restored to their original condition by the contractor at its expense within a reasonable time after the Government shall revoke the permit herein granted and in any event within a reasonable time after termination of this contract, provided that in the event of termination due to fault of the contractor such facilities may be retained in place at the option of the Government until service comparable to that provided for hereunder is obtained elsewhere. It is expressly understood, however, that proper military or governmental authority may limit or restrict the right of access herein granted in any manner considered by such authority to be necessary for the national security.

5. PUBLIC REGULATION AND CHANGE OF RATES

(a) Public regulation: Service furnished under this contract shall be subject to regulation in the manner and to the extent prescribed by law by any Federal, State, or local regulatory commission having jurisdiction. If during the term of this contract the public regulatory commission having jurisdiction receives for file in authorized manner rates that are higher or rates that are lower than those stipulated herein for like conditions of service, the contractor agrees to continue to furnish service as stipulated in this contract and the Government agrees to pay for such service at the higher or lower rates from and after the date when such rates are made effective.

(b) Change of rates: (1) Subject to paragraph (a) of this clause, in the event the contractor, during the term of this contract, shall make effective any new rate schedule or amended rate schedule applicable to the class of service furnished the Government at the service location which may contain a lower rate or conditions more favorable to the Government for such class of service, the contractor shall forward to the contracting officer a copy of such rate schedule or amended rate schedule within fifteen (15) days after the effective date thereof, and, upon receipt of written request from the Government, shall substitute such rate schedule or amended rate schedule for the rate schedule then in effect hereunder for such service location, commencing with the billing period in which such written request is received.

(11) Subject to paragraph (a) of this clause, in the event of a permanent change in the class of service furnished the Government at the service location, service shall, effective sixty (60) days after written request is made by either party or at such other time

as may be agreed upon, thereafter be furnished to such service location at the lowest available rate schedule of the contractor which is applicable to the class of service furnished following such permanent change.

6. OFFICIALS NOT TO BENEFIT

No Member of or Delegate to Congress, or Resident Commissioner, shall be admitted to any share or part of this contract, or to any benefit that may arise therefrom; but this provision shall not be construed to extend to this contract if made with a corporation for its general benefit.

7. COVENANT AGAINST CONTINGENT FEES

The contractor warrants that no person or selling agency has been employed or retained to solicit or secure this contract upon an agreement or understanding for a commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee, excepting bona fide employees or bona fide established commercial or selling agencies maintained by the contractor for the purpose of securing business. For breach or violation of this warranty the Government shall have the right to annul this contract without liability or in its discretion to deduct from the contract price or consideration the full amount of such commission, percentage, brokerage, or contingent fee.

8. ASSIGNMENT OF CLAIMS

No claim under this contract shall be assigned.

9. CONVICT LABOR

In connection with the performance of work under this contract, the contractor agrees not to employ any person undergoing sentence of imprisonment at hard labor.

10. NONDISCRIMINATION IN EMPLOYMENT

In connection with the performance of work under this contract, the contractor agrees not to discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of race, creed, color, or national origin; and further agrees to insert the foregoing provision in all subcontracts hereunder except subcontracts for standard commercial supplies or for raw materials.

11. DISPUTES

Except as otherwise provided in this contract, any dispute concerning a question of fact arising under this contract which is not disposed of by agreement shall be decided by the contracting officer, who shall reduce his decision to writing and mail or otherwise furnish a copy thereof to the contractor. Within 30 days from the date of receipt of such copy, the contractor may appeal by mailing or otherwise furnishing to the contracting officer a written appeal addressed to the head of the agency, and the decision of the head of the agency, or his duly authorized representative for the hearing of such appeals shall be final and conclusive: *Provided*, That if no such appeal is taken, the decision of the contracting officer shall be final and conclusive. In connection with any appeal proceeding from this clause, the contractor shall be afforded an opportunity to be heard and to offer evidence in support of its appeal. Pending final decision of a dispute hereunder, the contractor shall proceed diligently with the performance of the contract in accordance with the contracting officer's decision.

12. DEFINITIONS

As used throughout this contract, the following terms shall have the meanings set forth below:

(a) The term "contracting officer" means the person executing this contract on behalf of the Government, and any other officer or civilian employee who is a properly designated contracting officer; and the term includes, except as otherwise provided in this contract, the authorized representative of a contracting officer acting within the limits of this authority.

(b) Except as provided in this contract, the term "subcontracts" includes purchase orders under this contract.

13. CONFLICTS

To the extent of any inconsistency between the provisions of this contract, any schedule, rider, or exhibit incorporated in this contract by reference or otherwise, or any of the contractor's rules and regulations, the provisions of this contract shall control.

In witness whereof, the parties hereto have executed this contract as of the day and year first above written.

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

By E. H. CHAMBERLIN,
Contracting Officer.
VIRGINIA ELECTRIC &
POWER Co.,
By M. C. SMITH,
Vice President.

CERTIFICATE

I, L. G. Parrish, certify that I am the assistant secretary of the corporation named as contractor in the foregoing contract; that M. C. Smith, who signed said contract on behalf of the contractor, was then vice president of said corporation; that said contract was duly signed for and in behalf of said corporation by authority of its governing body and is within the scope of its corporate powers.

L. G. PARRISH.

ELECTRIC SERVICE SPECIFICATIONS

1. Premises to be served: Langley Field, Va.
2. Estimated service requirements: Estimated maximum demand, off-peak kilowatts, 150,000; on-peak kilowatts, 70,000. Estimated annual consumption, 120,000,000 kilowatt-hours. (The Government is in no way obligated to use nor is it restricted to the above-estimated requirements except as provided in paragraph 12 of these specifications.)

3. Point of delivery: The point of delivery of service hereunder shall be where contractor's facilities are connected to Government's facilities at Stratton Road substation.

4. Description of electric service: Contractor will supply three-phase, three-wire grounded neutral alternating current service at approximately 60 cycles and at a nominal line voltage level of 110,000. The voltage level and regulation will be as provided in paragraph 10 hereof.

5. Service connections: Service shall be over three 110-kilovolt transmission lines. One of these lines is to be the existing line with such modifications as are necessary. The second line shall be an additional 110-kilovolt circuit between Chesterfield Station and Langley Field. The third line will be run across the James River in the vicinity of Newport News and shall extend to the transmission system of the contractor on the south side of the river.

The three lines shall be terminated in a switch and terminal yard to be installed and maintained by contractor. Government agrees to the use of space on Langley Field adjacent to the Yorktown Road and coincident insofar as practicable with the area to be traversed by the service lines. Contractor shall install two circuits of 500,000 circular mill copper or equivalent between its terminal structure and Government's Stratton Road substation without imposing dead-end strains on Government's structure in excess of 2,000 pounds per wire.

6. Meters: The contractor shall supply metering equipment suitable for measuring the service with an accuracy consistent with established practices for the character of service rendered. The meters shall be located in contractor's station on the terminal of the line.

7. Meter readings: Meters shall be read on the last working day of each month by the contractor in the presence of a representative of Government. Whenever contractor

performs adjustments or calibrations of the metering equipment a representative of Government shall be present. It is agreed that all metering equipment used for billing purposes may be sealed by both the contractor and Government and no seals will be broken except in the presence of both.

8. Use of service: The service shall be used primarily for the operation of National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics (NACA) at Langley Field, however, Government reserves the privilege of serving other needs of Government at Langley Field with or without an exchange of funds between Government agencies. Government furthermore reserves the right to sell service to contractors engaged in actual construction work at Langley Field.

9. Parallel operation: (a) The Diesel-electric generating plant of Government may be used in parallel operation with the service by contractor. It is understood that the plant will not be used to supply the base load of the Government but will only be used as a peak-load plant to reduce the maximum demand on the contractor's service. The plant may be operated for other purposes by mutual agreement or for the supply of electric energy to the contractor as provided by separate contract.

(b) Within its reasonable ability to do so, without jeopardizing or impairing its own operations, Government will make electricity available to contractor during contractor's emergencies. Contractor shall notify Government of its expected emergency requirements as much in advance of such emergency as is possible, giving the schedule of expected requirements. Oral notice of contractor's emergency requirements shall be immediately confirmed in writing, stating that a curtailment in the supply of electricity is imminent or in effect.

(c) Contractor shall pay Government for all electricity generated by Government at contractor's request under paragraph 9 (b). Such electricity shall be determined by reading the integrating meter or meters at the Government's power plant. Said meter reading shall be taken by the Government and supplied to contractor as requested by contractor. At the end of each of contractor's billing periods, Government shall bill contractor for emergency electricity, generated at contractor's request, using the same overall unit cost per kilowatt hour as was used by the contractor in billing Government under exhibit A of this contract during the next preceding billing period when no emergency electricity was generated by Government at contractor's request. The kilowatt hours supplied and billed Government under this contract for each billing period during which emergency service is supplied by contractor shall be the total kilowatt hours generated by Government for contractor, plus the kilowatt hours delivered to Government by contractor, less the kilowatt hours delivered by Government into contractor's system.

10. Voltage regulation: The contractor shall provide regulated voltage which shall not exceed a band width of 105,000 volts minimum and 110,000 volts maximum under all permissible load conditions of this contract. Contractor shall install, own, maintain, and operate the necessary condenser capacity located adjacent to contractor's terminal structure. Facilities to permit convenient control of contractor's condenser capacity by Government shall be installed by contractor and Government will control, at contractor's direction, contractor's condenser capacity, to maintain operating voltage levels mutually agreed upon from time to time. Government will control this equipment only when its load dispatcher is on duty. No liability will accrue to Government for such control.

11. Power factor: The minimum power factor of the load will be maintained by Government to 95 percent lag for all loads

between 70,000 and 150,000 kilowatts. Smaller demands may be at a lower power factor, but will not exceed 21,600 regulated kilowatt-ampere flow to Government.

12. Power available: The maximum power available to Government hereunder during on-peak hours and during off-peak hours is delineated on exhibit B. Instantaneous swings will be limited to 10,000 kilowatts above the maxima indicated. This is not to be interpreted as applying to malfunction or failure of equipment.

13. Rate of change of power: The Government shall regulate its use of power so as not to exceed a rate of change of power of 10,000 kilowatts per minute under all operating conditions. This is not to be interpreted as applying to emergency shut-down in the event of malfunction or failures of equipment.

14. Grounding and relaying: The contractor shall furnish all necessary grounding and relaying equipment necessary for discriminating control of system faults occurring at or on the contractor's side of the service connection. Government will cooperate with the contractor in the coordination of its relaying and switching practices. Carrier equipment and relaying equipment now owned by Government may be coordinated into any mutually agreed upon relaying and protective system desired by the contractor.

The contractor and Government mutually agree to exchange freely data on system characteristics, relaying, protection, switching, performance characteristics, machinery characteristics, and all other engineering information to permit intelligent planning, design, and operation by both parties.

All relays that control the 110-kilovolt oil circuit breakers protecting contractor's 110-kilovolt lines and services to Government shall periodically be tested, set, and sealed by contractor. Said relays shall be tested and set in the presence of Government's representatives at settings determined by contractor. Initial settings and subsequent changes in settings of said relays shall be made by contractor after reasonable notice to Government. After reasonable notice to contractor, and with reasonable frequency, Government may require contractor to test and check the settings of any of said relays.

Government shall be provided with remote control of these lines at its switchboard for manual switching and for relay operation of service breakers to protect Government's equipment.

15. Operational communication: Government shall cooperate in notifying contractor daily in advance of its schedule of operations which will cause material changes in the demand on contractor.

In the event instant notification of load changes are required by the contractor, the necessary communication facilities will be provided and maintained at the contractor's expense.

EXHIBIT A

I. APPLICABILITY

This schedule is applicable to a contract demand of 70,000 kilowatts on-peak and 150,000 kilowatts off-peak.

II. RATE

(a) Monthly charge: First 5,000 kilowatts or less on-peak demand, \$5,900; all over 5,000 kilowatts on-peak demand, \$1 per kilowatt; all off-peak demand in excess of on-peak demand, 20 cents per kilowatt.

(b) Excess of on-peak contract demand: At any time during on-peak hours, if contractor agrees to and does make available to Government demand in excess of on-peak contract demand and Government uses this excess demand, such excess of the on-peak contract demand shall be treated for billing purposes as though it had been used during

the off-peak hours (10 p. m. to 7 a. m.). In this case the on-peak demand used for billing shall not be less than the on-peak contract demand.

(c) Monthly energy charge:

	Cents per kilowatt-hour
First 200 kilowatt-hours per kilowatt of demand.....	0.45
Next 200 kilowatt-hours per kilowatt of demand.....	.40
All over 400 kilowatt-hours per kilowatt of demand.....	.30

III. MINIMUM MONTHLY CHARGE

The minimum monthly charge will be the demand charge of the highest of the following:

(1) Current on-peak and off-peak measured demand.

(2) Seventy-five percent of the highest firm on-peak demand used for billing purposes during the preceding 11 months, or 25-percent of the contract demand during the first year following the date of initial delivery, 50-percent of the contract demand during the second year following the date of initial delivery and 75 percent of the contract demand for the remainder of the term of the agreement.

IV. DETERMINATION OF DEMAND

(a) The on-peak demand to be used in paragraph II (a) shall be determined each month by taking 75 percent of the highest average kilowatt load plus 25 percent of the highest average kilovolt-ampere load measured over any period of 30 consecutive minutes between the hours of 7 a. m. and 10 p. m. daily, except that the demand used for billing shall not be less than 75 percent of the demand established during the previous 11 months.

(b) The off-peak demand to be used in paragraph II (a) shall be determined each month by taking 75 percent of the highest average kilowatt load plus 25 percent of the highest average kilovolt-ampere load measured over any period of 30 consecutive minutes except between 7 a. m. and 10 p. m. daily.

(c) Demand to be used in paragraph II (c) shall be the measured monthly demand as determined in paragraph IV (a).

V. FUEL CLAUSE

When the cost of fuel to the company, as determined under the standard classification of accounts approved by the commission, is 1.0 cent or more above or below 14.0 cents per million B. t. u., then for each whole 0.5 cent variation above or below 14.0 cents per million B. t. u. the cost of energy delivered hereunder shall be increased or decreased at the rate of 0.0075 cent per kilowatt-hour.

This charge for each current month shall be based on costs recorded during the second preceding calendar month.

APPEAL FOR EXPEDITIOUS ACTION ON THE BUSINESS OF THE SENATE

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wish to make an appeal to Senators to be present on the floor of the Senate tomorrow at 12 o'clock. As I stated the other day, we have an average of three quorum calls a day; and it takes 20 minutes, on the average, to obtain a quorum. That amounts to a total of an hour a day which we lose every day on quorum calls; and an hour a day for 5 days amounts to 5 hours. In other words, we are losing from the time of the Senate one legislative day a week, as a result of quorum calls.

I hope Senators will be present tomorrow at noon, so that we can proceed with consideration of the joint resolution of the Senator from Nevada and can

quickly dispose of it, and then resume the consideration of the appropriation bill. I hope we can make more progress tomorrow with the consideration of that bill than we have made in the last few days.

Mr. President, I wish to say further, that unless we can make more progress on these bills we shall have to have some evening sessions. I hope we will not have to resort to them; I hope we can proceed with their consideration and dispose of them without having to hold evening sessions.

MEETING OF APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON STATE, JUSTICE, AND COMMERCE DEPARTMENTS APPROPRIATIONS

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, we are getting behind with the appropriation bills. For 2½ months we have been holding hearings on the State, Justice, and Commerce Departments appropriation bill. The House has not yet passed that bill; it probably will pass it next week.

In the Appropriations Committee, we are dealing with the State Department appropriations phase of that bill. At 7 o'clock this evening we shall hold a meeting in an attempt to complete action on the State Department division of that bill. We shall greatly appreciate it if the members of the subcommittee will attend the meeting at room F-82 for several hours this evening.

PRICING PRACTICES—MODIFICATION OF UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I spoke to the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. LONG] about a modification of the unanimous-consent agreement which was entered into on July 2 in regard to the bill (S. 719) to establish beyond doubt that, under the Robinson-Patman Act, it is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination for the seller to show that its price differential has been made in good faith to meet the equally low price of a competitor. At that time I forgot to place in the agreement the usual provision that in case the Senator who is in charge of the bill favors an amendment which has been proposed, the time in opposition to the amendment will be in the control of the minority leader.

Therefore, Mr. President, I now ask unanimous consent to modify the unanimous-consent agreement by making the following insertion in it, after the name of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], where it appears the second time; "but in the event Mr. KEFAUVER is in favor of any such amendment or motion, the time in opposition thereto shall be controlled by the minority leader [Mr. WHERRY] or some Senator designated by him."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the requested modification of the unanimous-consent agreement? The Chair hears none, and the modification is made.

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT APPROPRIATIONS, 1952

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3790) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I call up my amendment on page 5 of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 5, in line 4, it is proposed to strike out "\$2,314,400" and insert "\$2,814,400."

On page 5, line 8, after the word "granted", it is proposed to insert: "Provided, That \$500,000 of the amount appropriated herein shall be available for purchase of electric power and energy and for leasing of transmission lines and related facilities of others."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KERR. I yield.

Mr. HAYDEN. The Senator from Oklahoma is proposing an amendment to the next committee amendment which was passed over, and which is in order at this time. We have just disposed of the committee amendment on page 4. Now the Senator from Oklahoma is offering an amendment to increase the amount of money proposed in the committee amendment on page 5, line 4.

Mr. KERR. That is correct.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the amendment submitted by the Senator from Oklahoma is submitted to a committee amendment, the committee amendment should first be reported stated before amendments are offered to it.

The next committee amendment previously passed over will be stated.

The next amendment passed over was, under the subhead "Construction, Southwestern Power Administration," on page 5, line 4, after the word "expended", to strike out "\$3,375,000" and insert "\$2,314,400, of which not to exceed \$586,800 shall be available for personal services, and."

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the Senator from Oklahoma proposes to amend that amendment by increasing the amount and by earmarking a part of the increase.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that the part increasing the amount is an amendment to the committee amendment, but that the remainder of the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma is an amendment to the bill. In other words, the Senator's amendment seems to be double-barreled. Is that correct?

Mr. KERR. I believe it is an amendment to the committee amendment, because the committee amendment struck out a proviso at the same place in the bill where the proviso which I offer in my amendment would be inserted.

Mr. HAYDEN. Then there would be two amendments.

Mr. KERR. Yes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If the latter part of the Senator's amendment were

placed at the end of the paragraph, it would be in order.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, in that regard I should like to say that I deeply regret the action the Senate has taken today with reference to the continuing fund. However, I am convinced that many Senators voted as they did on the amendment because they felt that the old continuing fund would give the Administrator powers which they described as being ones which would usurp certain legislative powers. I am convinced that many of the Senators who voted in favor of the committee amendment are just as anxious to make it possible for the REA to operate and for the Southwestern Power Administration to operate with them, as though those Senators had voted the other way.

Mr. President, I am convinced that the amendment I am now offering to the committee amendment would enable the Southwestern Power Administration, through a legislative act and appropriation by the Congress, to perform its functions in accordance with its contract for the fiscal year. Therefore, I ask that my amendment to the committee amendment be accepted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Oklahoma to the amendment of the committee on page 5, line 4.

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, no yeand-nay vote was taken on the amendment just offered by the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma. I desire to say I think that what he has suggested is the proper way by which the authorization should be made. I had already asked the Senator whether a legislative committee had ever considered such a proposal, and I understood him to say he did not know. He had not had a chance, of course, to search the record. I was one of the Senators who believed that the revolving fund was being used for purposes other than the purposes intended by the provision in the present law. I think the Senator from Oklahoma has proposed the proper way to legislate in the matter of aid to the REA's, and I want the Record to show that I voted in the affirmative on his amendment, in order to provide the necessary appropriation.

Mr. KERR. Mr. President, I wish to thank the distinguished Senator from Nebraska for his statement, and I would like to say for the Record that he is one of the Senators with whom I conferred in the preparation and submission of the amendment. I did so feeling that he was for the end sought by the amendment, and I wish to thank him for what he has said.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have an amendment to the same paragraph.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment as amended.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I had intended to make certain observations on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oklahoma, but had no opportunity.

I was on my feet, addressing the Chair, but I was not recognized, and the vote was taken. I do not know yet, and I do not think any other Senator, except perhaps the Senator from Oklahoma, knows exactly what the amendment, which has been offered and adopted post-haste, will do. I frankly say I do not know. But I want to say now that if it does what it might well do, I shall move to reconsider the vote by which it was agreed to. I shall not do it today. My understanding from the Senator from Arizona [Mr. HAYDEN] was that the amendment would be explained today and would be voted on tomorrow. Instead, it was rushed through without any Senator getting an opportunity to read it, much less to understand it.

I believe that a thorough understanding of substantive legislation should be had by the United States Senate before it adopts a completely new policy in any field. I believe this particular amendment will, in effect, have that result. Perhaps it will not, but we should have had an opportunity to hear it discussed and to study it before we voted upon it.

I call attention to the fact that it provides for \$500,000 for the purchase of electrical energy. It does not indicate what is to be done with the energy purchased. There is no authority for making such a purchase, other than what is found in this amendment. The action of the Senate, I say with all due deference, may have been taken in ignorance, because the Senate did not understand the situation.

The amendment may well result in confirming contracts which were the basis of the action taken by the Senate a little while ago when, after thorough debate, it adopted the committee amendment, limiting the effect of the continuing fund.

I want to do anything that can be done to straighten out the situation in Oklahoma, and I will do it; but I do not believe we should be whipped into doing it in the way it was done, and tomorrow, after a careful study of it, I may offer a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Kerr amendment was adopted.

Mr. CASE. Mr. President, I have an amendment, marked "7-9-51-C," which pertains to this paragraph which has been amended, which I should like to call up and have considered.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is it an amendment to the committee amendment?

Mr. CASE. It is an amendment in line 8.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair would suggest that we are now on a different amendment. It seems that the Senator's amendment is an amendment to the next amendment, which has not yet been acted upon. The question now is on the committee amendment as amended. The Senator's amendment apparently comes later on, to a different part. The question is on the amendment as amended.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, again we are faced with a situation which arises by virtue of the amendment, as amended. In what I deem to be fair-

ness to Members of this body, who are entitled to know what they are doing before they do it, in my opinion this matter should go over until tomorrow, in order that Senators may have an opportunity to study the present situation with respect to this particular amendment and its legal effects.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have been trying to get the floor. I wanted to move that the Senate recess, because I had told Senators I was going to do that, and I do not think it would be fair to vote on the matter now, after some of the Senators have left the floor.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I would be happy to yield the floor for the purpose of a motion to recess.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGE REFERRED

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States submitting a nomination, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services:

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina, from the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service:

Sundry postmasters.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If there be no further reports of committees, the nominations on the Executive Calendar will be stated.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Edward Jordan Dimock to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Cyril Michael to be United States attorney for the district court of the Virgin Islands.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Harvey Erickson to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Washington.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Loomis E. Cranor to be United States marshal for the western district of Kentucky.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The Chief Clerk read the nomination of Wayne Bezona to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

The Chief Clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Public Health Service.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask that the nominations in the Public Health Service be confirmed en bloc.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the nominations in the Public Health Service are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations this day confirmed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the Executive Calendar.

RECESS

Mr. McFARLAND. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate stand in recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 48 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, July 11, 1951, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATION

Executive nomination received by the Senate July 10 (legislative day of June 27), 1951:

IN THE ARMY

Col. Bickford Edward Sawyer, O8349, United States Army, for appointment as Chief of Finance, United States Army, and as major general in the Regular Army of the United States, under the provisions of section 206 of the Army Organization Act of 1950 and section 513 of the Officer Personnel Act of 1947.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 10 (legislative day of June 27), 1951:

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Edward Jordan Dimock to be United States district judge for the southern district of New York.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS

Cyril Michael to be United States attorney for the district court of the Virgin Islands.

Harvey Erickson to be United States attorney for the eastern district of Washington. (Now serving under an appointment which expired February 7, 1951.)

UNITED STATES MARSHALS

Loomis E. Cranor to be United States marshal for the western district of Kentucky.

Wayne Bezona to be United States marshal for the eastern district of Washington.

PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR CORPS OF THE PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE

To be medical director (equivalent to the Army rank of colonel), effective date of acceptance

James A. Shannon

To be senior surgeon (equivalent to the Army rank of lieutenant colonel), effective date of acceptance

E. Ross Jenney

To be surgeons (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Charles E. Smith
Gert L. Laqueur
William J. Card

To be sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Ralph J. Van Derwerker
Harry W. Poston

To be junior assistant pharmacists (equivalent to the Army rank of second lieutenant), effective date of acceptance

David E. Sutliff
Carl H. Brown
Bertram J. Baughman

To be nurse officer (equivalent to the Army rank of major), effective date of acceptance

Margaret T. De Lawter

To be assistant sanitary engineers (equivalent to the Army rank of first lieutenant)

Dade W. Moeller Roy O. McCaldin
Richard D. Coleman Charles V. Wright, Jr.
John V. Miner, Jr. Gordon E. Stone

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JULY 10, 1951

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, who hast revealed Thyself as a presence to strengthen and a light to lead, may this new day be rich in the realization of Thy divine power and guidance.

Grant that we may be endowed with a faith which will make us victorious over all the dark and disquieting moods that frequently baffle and play such havoc with our souls.

May we have within our hearts that peace which is begotten of simple trust in Thee, and may we realize more fully that when we have Thee we have everything.

Fill us with an eager desire to know and do Thy will, and may we follow faithfully and courageously the ways of righteousness and justice which Thou hast marked out for us.

May we be united in the service of our beloved country, not merely striving to the utmost to dethrone and destroy the gods of war but seeking to build a nation that is spiritually minded lest the darkness of secularism and materialism and atheism descend upon us.

Hear us in Christ's name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

GEN. JAMES A. VAN FLEET

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIKES. Mr. Speaker, I note with pride and gratification the promotion of James A. Van Fleet, commander of the Eighth Army in Korea, to the rank of full general.

A distinguished son of Florida, General Van Fleet has done an outstanding job throughout his career. He has shown particular skill and ability in coping with Communist military tactics. In plainer words, he whipped them in Greece and he whipped them in Korea. His rank and stature have been earned the hard way.

He is clearly one of America's ablest present-day military leaders.

JOSEPH A. MYERS ET AL.

Mr. BYRNE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 953) for the relief of Joseph A. Myers, Hazel C. Myers, and Helen Myers, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 7, strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$1,000."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONTROL OF INFLATION

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is now perfectly obvious that the Democratic Party has no genuine desire to curb inflation. The solid vote of the Democrats yesterday against a Republican proposal declaring as a matter of policy that the present authority of the Secretary of the Treasury and Federal Reserve Board to exercise control on credit, bank deposits, and public financing concurrently with the direct controls of prices and wages makes it readily apparent that they intend to make a political issue of the distressing conditions caused by inflation. This is natural and understandable because it means thousands of jobs to their faithful followers and gives them an opportunity of paying lip service to the plight of the distressed consumers but it does not indicate a proper regard for the national welfare. Though understandable, it is unpardonable.

Certainly the existing laws with respect to indirect control of our credit and money supply were intended to be used and used effectively to control either inflation or deflation. The refusal by the Democrats to use these powers is unforgivable and shows their colors in striking contrast to the flag of genuine statesmanship. For 20 years Truman and his cohorts have fooled the American public. Certainly the country can

not withstand their mismanagement much longer. Complete socialism or bankruptcy, or both, is the inevitable result of the policies of the Democratic Party.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 5 minutes today, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

MAKING PEACE WITH GERMANY

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, according to the press a message, or a letter, has been sent by the President to the House and the Senate with reference to making peace with Germany. I should like to know if that message has been delivered to the House, or if it is available.

The SPEAKER. It has been referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed.

Mr. RANKIN. Has it been published in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD?

The SPEAKER. It has not.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks and include a resolution to declare the war at an end, a resolution I introduced on February 28 of this year.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the resolution is as follows:

House Joint Resolution 177

Joint resolution terminating the state of war between the United States and the Imperial Government of Japan and between the United States and the Government of Germany

Resolved, etc., That the state of war declared to exist between the United States and the Imperial Government of Japan by joint resolution of Congress approved December 8, 1941 (55 Stat. 795), is hereby declared at an end.

SEC. 2. The state of war declared to exist between the United States and the Government of Germany by joint resolution of Congress approved December 11, 1941 (55 Stat. 796), is hereby declared at an end.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. When can we have an opportunity to vote on that proposition?

The SPEAKER. When it is reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Mr. RANKIN. Are we going to have to wait on them?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. That will probably be after the next war, I am afraid.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not know anything about that.

Mr. RANKIN. If we should get into a war with Communist Russia we would need the help of the German people. The sooner we make peace with them the better it is going to be for us, as well as for them, and for our white Christian civilization as a whole.

STATE, JUSTICE, COMMERCE, AND THE
JUDICIARY APPROPRIATION BILL, FISCAL
YEAR 1952

Mr. ROONEY, from the Committee on Appropriations, reported the bill (H. R. 4740) making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes (Rept. No. 685) which was read a first and second time, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed.

Mr. STEFAN reserved all points of order on the bill.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. This is Private Calendar day. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

ARTHUR HENDRIK SORENSEN, MAREN ANDERSON SORENSEN, AND MINOR CHILD, EVELYN SORENSEN

The Clerk called the bill (S. 51) for the relief of Arthur Henrik Sorensen, Maren Anderson Sorensen, and minor child, Evelyn Sorensen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Arthur Henrik Sorensen, Maren Anderson Sorensen, and minor child, Evelyn Sorensen, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. GEORGE (WONG TZE-YEN) POY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 124) for the relief of Mrs. George (Wong Tze-yen) Poy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. George (Wong Tze-yen) Poy, who is the widow of a native-born citizen of the United States and the mother of seven children who are citizen residents of the United States, and who, but for the death of her husband, would be entitled to non-quota immigration status, shall, if otherwise found admissible to the United States, be deemed to be a returning resident under the provisions of section 4 (b) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAFAEL KUBELIK, LUDMILA KUBELIK, AND MARTIN KUBELIK

The Clerk called the bill (S. 275) for the relief of Rafael Kubelik, his wife, Ludmila Kubelik, and their minor son, Martin Kubelik.

XCVII—496

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Rafael Kubelik, his wife, Ludmila Kubelik, and their minor son, Martin Kubelik, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct appropriate numbers from the first available appropriate quota or quotas.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SISTER BERTHA PFEIFFER AND SISTER ELZBIETA ZABINSKA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 470) for the relief of Sister Bertha Pfeiffer and Sister Elzbieta Zabinska.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister Bertha Pfeiffer and Sister Elzbieta Zabinska shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quotas for the first year that such quotas are available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 11, after "numbers", strike out "from the appropriate quotas for the first year that such quotas are available" and insert "from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONRAD XAVIER CHARLES MAUERER

The Clerk called the bill (S. 631) for the relief of Conrad Xavier Charles Maurer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Conrad Xavier Charles Maurer shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LUIGI PODESTA

The Clerk called the bill (S. 879) for the relief of Luigi Podesta.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Luigi Podesta shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAN JOSEF WIECKOWSKI AND FAMILY

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1229) for the relief of Jan Josef Wieckowski and his wife and daughter.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Jan Josef Wieckowski, his wife, Irena, and daughter, Maria, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct the required numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

On line 11, after the words "to deduct", strike out the remainder of the bill and insert in lieu thereof the following: "three numbers from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES M. SHELLENBERGER, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (S. 699) for the relief of James M. Shellenberger, Jr., a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the legal guardian of James M. Shellenberger, Jr., a minor, of Mishawaka, Ind., the sum of \$50,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the injury of said James M. Shellenberger, Jr., which resulted in the permanent loss of sight in his left eye, the partial loss of sight in his right eye, and facial disfigurement, caused by the use of an improper solution of silver nitrate in the eyes of said infant at the time of his birth in the Sixty-first Station Hospital, United States Army.

at Leghorn, Italy, on January 8, 1947: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HENDRYK KEMPSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 579) for the relief of Hendryk Kempinski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Hendryk Kempinski, who arrived at the port of New York, N. Y., June 4, 1949, shall, upon the payment of the required head tax, be considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Polish quota for the first year that Polish quota numbers are available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Hendryk Kempinski shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KWANGNYENG CHU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 580) for the relief of Kwangnyeng Chu.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Kwangnyeng Chu, of Neptune, N. J., who entered the United States on a visitor's visa, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence, upon payment of the required head tax and visa fee.

Sec. 2. The Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Kwang Myeng Chu shall be held and considered to have been lawfully

admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Kwang Myeng Chu."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ISABEL TABIT

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 581) for the relief of Isabel Tabit.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Isabel Tabit, Montgomery, W. Va., who entered the United States on January 14, 1949, as a temporary visitor, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted, as of such date, to the United States for permanent residence. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for the Lebanon for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Isabel Tabit shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. TJITSKE BANDSTRA VAN DER VELDE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 627) for the relief of Mrs. Tjitske Bandstra Van Der Velde.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 8, sec. 136), the alien Mrs. Tjitske Bandstra Van Der Velde, whose husband, John Van Der Velde, and two children are residents and citizens of the United States, shall be admitted to the United States for permanent residence as a nonquota immigrant.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That notwithstanding the provision of the second category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Mrs. Tjitske Band-

stra Van Der Velde may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RAMUTE ALEXANDRA VAILOKAITIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 677) for the relief of Ramute Alexandra Vailokaitis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Ramute Alexandra Vailokaitis, upon payment of the required head tax, be considered, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence on May 14, 1949. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Lithuanian quota of the first year that the same Lithuanian quota is available.

Sec. 2. That the Attorney General is directed to cancel forthwith any warrant of arrest, order of deportation, warrant of deportation, and bond, if any, in the case of the alien Ramute Alexandra Vailokaitis.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Ramute Alexandra Vailokaitis shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTON BERNHARD BLIKSTAD

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 870) for the relief of Anton Bernhard Blikstad.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Anton Bernhard Blikstad as of January 18, 1949, at New York, N. Y., the date and place he entered the United States legally as a visitor. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Spain for the first year that such quota is hereafter available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That for the purposes of the immigration

and naturalization laws, Anton Bernhard Bliksta, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANTONIOS CHARALAMBOU

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 970) to adjust the status of an alien who is in the United States and who is a quota immigrant.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object.

The SPEAKER. There is no reservation of objection on the Private Calendar. There must be an objection or a request to pass the bill over.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to make some inquiry about this.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the gentleman cannot do it. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Then I object to this bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Two objections are required.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present. If we are going to tear down the immigration laws in this way, we ought to all be here to see it done.

The SPEAKER. The Chair must enforce the rules of the House.

The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll Call No. 106]

Armstrong	Flood	Mumma
Beall	Gillette	Murray, Wis.
Blatnik	Havener	O'Konski
Bosone	Hill	Powell
Boykin	Irving	Prouty
Breen	Jenkins	Sabath
Burdick	Kearney	Scott, Hardie
Chatham	Kelley, Pa.	Shafer
Coudert	Latham	Sheppard
Curtis, Mo.	Lyle	Thompson,
Dawson	Mason	Mich.
Dingell	Mitchell	Woodruff
Dolliver	Morrison	
Durham	Moulder	

The SPEAKER. On this roll call 393 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

ANTONIOS CHARALAMBOU

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill

(H. R. 970) to adjust the status of an alien who is in the United States and who is a quota immigrant?

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Antonios Charalambou shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in opposition to the bill.

I yield to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. GARMATZ] to explain the measure. Let me say to the gentleman from Maryland that what I am trying to do is to prevent the gradual destruction of our immigration laws by piecemeal. The gentleman from Maryland is the author of this bill, and according to his explanation this bill would not have that effect. I would like for him to state to us just what it does.

Mr. GARMATZ. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Charalambou is a native of Greece, born May 15, 1902, and since his fifteenth year has been a seaman. He sailed aboard American vessels continuously since August 1941 and up to his last discharge on October 13, 1950. In 1940, immediately prior to the commencement of his service aboard American ships, he was aboard two Greek merchant ships in American-European commerce which were torpedoed. In the summer of 1941 the alien made application for papers to ship aboard American ships, was accepted, and at once shipped out on the *Silver Sword* on August 30, 1941. He remained in constant service aboard the *Silver Sword* until this ship was torpedoed on September 20, 1942, while returning from a run to Archangel, U. S. S. R. He was rescued by an English ship in this convoy, which was in turn torpedoed, and then by a Dutch ship in the same convoy, also torpedoed. After several hours in the water he was again rescued and landed in England by a British destroyer. He returned to the United States as a rescued seaman aboard the *Queen Mary*, and by January 12, 1943, was again aboard an American merchant ship, the *Henry St. George Tucker*, on which he stayed to September 27, 1943. After more than 2 years steady service aboard American ships during the early war period, he became ill because of a stomach disorder, and was forced off the ships but for a period of less than 6 months, being all of the time under a doctor's care. He reported to the Immigration Service his disability and was permitted to remain in the United States under the care of his doctor.

Again, on March 17, 1944, he went back to sea aboard the American ship, *Conrad Weiser*, and remained on board until September 5, 1944, when his old disorder returned and forced him ashore, where he remained under care of a physician for almost a year, returning to the ships

aboard the ships *Lone Star*, August 5 to September 22, 1945; *Charles N. Coe*, November 7 to February 9, 1946; and *Walker D. Hines*, March 21 to October 11, 1946. It might be noted that during the alien's illnesses ashore, he did not take shore employment and kept the Immigration Service advised of his presence and the reason for his inability to ship.

The alien continued shipping American, and next remained aboard the *Park Benjamin* from December 16, 1946, to November 29, 1947, shipping on the *Wm. H. Aspinwall*, January 25 to March 22, 1948, on the *George Walton*, July 31 to September 10, 1948, and on the *Donald H. Holland*, December 29, 1948, to March 28, 1949.

After concluding service aboard the *Holland*, the alien learned that he was eligible to apply for American citizenship in accordance with the provisions of section 325 of the Nationality Act of 1940. Having long had the desire to become an American citizen, the alien at once took the first step toward citizenship, filing the Form N-400 with the Immigration and Naturalization Service at New York in April 1949. While waiting to hear from the service, the alien did not wish to remain illegally in the United States and shipped again aboard an American ship, the *Pan Virginia*, July 13, 1949, but when this vessel was ordered into the coastwise service, the alien was forced to leave the ship because of regulations against aliens serving on coastwise vessels. Meanwhile, the Immigration and Naturalization Service, New York, addressed a letter to the alien on June 21, 1949, requesting him to come in to complete his application and, inferentially, to prepare his formal petition for citizenship. This letter was not forwarded to the alien from his New York address, the alien being then in Baltimore seeking a ship. Thereafter the alien, still awaiting further word on his application for citizenship, shipped on December 3, 1949, on the *Cygnets III*, and remained on board continuously until October 13, 1950, when the alien signed off at New York, and learned for the first time of the letter of June 21, 1949. It is of interest to note that the *Cygnets III* spent almost its entire cruise in far-eastern waters, returning to the United States twice to reload for brief periods at Mobile, Ala., and Gulfport, Miss.

At last receiving the long delayed letter of June 21, 1949, the alien went immediately to the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and thereafter to your correspondent in an effort to move consideration of his long pending application to petition for citizenship. Meanwhile, as is well known to you, the Congress enacted the Internal Security Act of 1950, containing a provision, section 26, amending section 325 (a) of the 1940 Nationality Act so that only seamen who were permanent immigrants could thereafter count American ship service toward residence credit for naturalization. An exception was provided, but only for seamen who had filed their formal petitions for naturalization prior to enactment of the law, September 23, 1950. No provision was made for those who had filed the required form of application to petition for naturalization, and who

through circumstances beyond their control had not been able to complete formal filing before September 23, 1950.

In this case, the alien, with years of service, many under the most dangerous circumstances, was actually again serving in a danger area at a time when the law was passed depriving him of a privilege which he highly desired and for which he had taken the preliminary steps.

The alien presently resides in Baltimore, at 931 East Baltimore Street, and has at all times been a law-abiding person.

Mr. RANKIN. This measure designates this individual, does it?

Mr. GARMATZ. That is right.

Mr. RANKIN. And it does not apply to anyone else?

Mr. GARMATZ. That is right. It is really a bill for the relief of Antonios Charalambou.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. GRAHAM. As a matter of fact this takes one number off the quota number, so far as that is concerned.

Mr. GARMATZ. That is right. The bill says that one number shall be deducted from the appropriate quota.

Mr. WALTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. WALTER. The effect of the enactment of this bill will be to substitute the name of this man for that of some other alien who is on the quota list, but whose name has not been reached.

Mr. GARMATZ. The gentleman from Pennsylvania is correct.

Mr. RANKIN. It is limited to one individual? That does not show in the record here, and that is what I was trying to find out.

Mr. GARMATZ. The bill states on line 9 of page 1 that the "Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the gentleman.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Antonios Charalambou."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SISTER NATALIE AND SISTER ALICE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1136) for the relief of Sister Natalie (Marie Palagyi) and Sister Alice (Elizabeth Slachta).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Sister Natalie (Marie Palagyi), who arrived at the port of New York, February 7, 1950, and Sister Alice (Elizabeth Slachta), who arrived at the port of San Francisco, Calif., October 13, 1949, shall, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax, be considered for the purpose of immigration and naturalization laws, to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota

control officer to deduct two numbers from the quota of Hungary, for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister Natalie (Marie Palagyi) and Sister Alice (Elizabeth Slachta) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct two numbers from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. EUGEN JOSE SINGER AND MRS. FRIEDA SINGER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1420) for the relief of Dr. Eugen Jose Singer and Mrs. Frieda Singer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Attorney General is authorized and directed to discontinue any deportation proceedings and to cancel any outstanding orders and warrants of deportation, warrants of arrest, and bonds, which may have been issued in the cases of Dr. Eugen Jose Singer and Mrs. Frieda Singer. From and after the date of enactment of this act, the said Dr. Eugen Jose Singer and the said Mrs. Frieda Singer shall not be subject to deportation by reason of the same facts upon which such deportation proceedings were commenced or any such warrants or orders have been issued.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the said Dr. Eugen Jose Singer and the said Mrs. Frieda Singer shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendments:

On page 1, strike out all of lines 3 through 12.

On page 2, line 1, strike out the words "SEC. 2."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SISTER M. CROCEFISSA AND SISTER M. REGINALDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2158) for the relief of Sister M. Crocefissa and Sister M. Reginalda.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister M. Crocefissa (Maria Pozzobon) and Sister M. Reginalda (Giovannina Gemin), who were admitted to the United States on temporary visas, shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the dates of their last entries, on payment of the required visa fees and head taxes.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister M. Crocefissa (Maria Pozzobon) and Sister M. Reginalda (Giovannina Gemin) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SISTER M. LEONIDA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2160) for the relief of Sister M. Leonida.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister M. Leonida (Zanka Gotcheva), who was admitted to the United States on a temporary visa, shall be deemed to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of her last entry, on payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert in lieu thereof the following: "That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Sister M. Leonida (Zanka Gotcheva) shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota officer to deduct one number from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAI YOUNG LEE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2292) for the relief of Jai Young Lee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, as amended, shall not apply to Jai Young Lee, the Korean stepchild of an honorably discharged veteran of World War II, and that, if otherwise admissible under the immigration laws, she shall be granted admission into the United States as a nonquota immigrant for permanent residence.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "of", insert "Frank Lee."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "War", strike out the balance of line 7, all of lines 8 and 9 and down to and including the word "residence" in line 10, and insert "II. For the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the said Jai Young Lee shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of the said Frank Lee."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS ALVA RAPHAEL (RICHARDS)

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2787) for the relief of Thomas Alva Raphael (Richards).

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That, in the administration of the immigration laws, section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall not apply to Thomas Alva Raphael (Richards), Japanese minor child in the care of Staff Sgt. and Mrs. Thomas G. Richards. For the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the said Thomas Alva Raphael (Richards) shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of the said Staff Sgt. and Mrs. Thomas G. Richards.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

IRENE SENUTOVITCH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3214) for the relief of Irene Senutovitch.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien Irene Senutovitch, who entered the United States as a temporary visitor, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to make the appropriate quota deduction with respect to such alien.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "Senutovitch", strike out the balance of line 4, all of lines 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9, and down to and including the word "alien" in line 10, and insert "shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such

alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANN ELISABETH (DIANA ELIZABETH) REINGRUBER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3819) for the relief of Ann Elisabeth (Diana Elizabeth) Reingruber.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That, for the purpose of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor child, Ann Elisabeth (Diana Elizabeth) Reingruber, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born child of Capt. and Mrs. Billy J. Munnerlyn, citizens of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SHOZO ICHIWAWA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3823) for the relief of Shozo Ichiwawa.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That, in the administration of the immigration laws, section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall not apply to Shozo Ichiwawa, Japanese minor child in the care of Staff Sergeant and Mrs. Robert Yung. For the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the said Shozo Ichiwawa shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of said Staff Sergeant and Mrs. Robert Yung.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DR. GEORGE ALEXANDROS CHRONAKIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4038) for the relief of Dr. George Alexandros Chronakis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Dr. George Alexandros Chronakis, of Knoxville, Tenn., shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STATUS OF PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

The Clerk called the next business (H. Con. Res. 111) granting permanent residence to certain aliens.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this resolution be passed over without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

CARROLL O. SWITZER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 623) for the relief of Carroll O. Switzer.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That, notwithstanding section 1204 of the General Appropriation Act, 1951, or any other provision of law, there shall be paid, out of any appropriation available for payment of salaries of judges of the district courts of the United States, to Carroll O. Switzer a sum representing the salary of a judge of a district court of the United States for the period which the said Carroll O. Switzer served as district judge for the southern district of Iowa after August 9, 1950.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MAJ. BRUCE B. CALKINS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 828) for the relief of Maj. Bruce B. Calkins.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Maj. Bruce B. Calkins, Air Force Reserve, AO 335-054, the sum of \$962. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Maj. Bruce B. Calkins against the United States arising when, as a result of a temporary change in Army regulations, he was deprived of terminal leave to which he would otherwise have been entitled: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$962" and insert "\$475.78."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

R. E. AGEE AND MARGARET E. AGEE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1485) for the relief of R. E. Agee and Margaret E. Agee.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc. That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to R. E. Agee and Margaret E. Agee, Orland, Calif., the sum of \$28,749.42. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said R. E. Agee and Margaret E. Agee against

the United States arising out of the destruction and depreciation of their livestock, improvements, and equipment on San Nicolas Island, Calif., as the result of Government construction of military installations on the island during 1942 and 1943 and Government termination, on March 19, 1943, of the revocable permit under which they had occupied the island for grazing purposes since June 11, 1934: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$28,749.42" and insert "\$7,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JAMES J. LIEBERMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1688) for the relief of James J. Lieberman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to James J. Lieberman, Detroit, Mich., the sum of \$1,700. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said James J. Lieberman against the United States arising out of a collision on June 19, 1948, at Giessen, Germany, between his automobile and an Army vehicle driven by a member of the United States Army. At the time of the collision, which was caused by the negligence of the driver of the Army vehicle, Mr. Lieberman was driving his automobile in line of duty as a member of the United States Army. No part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GUY CHRISTIAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1961) for the relief of Guy Christian.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Guy Christian (formerly known as McVea J. Vigouroux, staff sergeant, 14026146, AC), San Jose, Calif., the sum of \$450. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Guy Christian against the United States for reimbursement of expenses necessarily incurred by him in evading capture by the enemy, and ultimately returning to the

military control of the United States, while serving in guerrilla bands in the Philippine Islands during the Japanese occupation of such islands in World War II: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. ALFRED PULLIAM

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2275) for the relief of J. Alfred Pulliam.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. Alfred Pulliam, of Waukegan, Ill., the sum of \$20,000 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings sustained as a result of an accident involving a United States Army vehicle, on December 22, 1944, at Pearl Harbor, Territory of Hawaii: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of any services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$20,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$17,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

OLLIE O. EVANS, JR.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2459) for the relief of Ollie O. Evans, Jr.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 15 to 20, inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended (5 U. S. C. 765-769), are hereby waived in favor of Ollie O. Evans, Jr., for compensation for disability allegedly caused by his employment as a member of the Civilian Conservation Corps, in Jones County, Miss., in 1936, is authorized and directed to be considered and acted upon under the remaining provisions of such act, as amended, if he files such claim with the Federal Security Agency (Bureau of Employees' Com-

pensation) not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act. No benefits shall accrue by reason of the enactment of this act for any period prior to the date of its enactment.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, lines 2 and 3, strike out "Federal Security Agency" and insert in lieu thereof "Department of Labor."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

THOMAS G. DIGGES

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2550) for the relief of Thomas G. Digges.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of funds of the District of Columbia, to Thomas G. Digges, Arlington, Va., the sum of \$96. Payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Thomas G. Digges against the District of Columbia for refund of the amount of the nonresident tuition fee which he paid on September 1, 1949, to the District of Columbia for the attendance of his son, Robert H. Digges, at Gordon Junior High School for the first semester of the 1949-50 school year. The said Robert H. Digges attended such school for only 1 day, September 13, 1949, before withdrawing to attend school in Virginia but refund of such fee by the District of Columbia is not authorized because payment thereof was legally and properly made: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ELWOOD GRISSINGER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3730) for the relief of the estate of Elwood Grissinger.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay and deliver to the estate of the late Elwood Grissinger, of Buffalo, N. Y., in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States, on account of the use outside of the United States of certain long-distance telephone patents, inventions, and devices of the said Grissinger by the American Expeditionary Forces during the World War and the subsequent sale thereof, such amounts of bonds which the United States received from the Republic of France and other foreign countries, through the United States Liquidating Commission, as the Secretary of Defense, with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, finds to be equitable compensation as a result of such use and sale. The Court of Claims is hereby authorized and directed to render to the Secretary of Defense its opinion as to any matter as to which he requests to be advised, but such opinion, if any be

requested and rendered, shall not limit the authority of the Secretary of Defense to determine suitable compensation hereunder.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLIAM C. REED

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2858) for the relief of William C. Reed.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to William C. Reed, of Pasadena, Calif., the sum of \$5,710.20 for the damages caused to his property located in Riverside County, Calif., on September 21, 1943, as the result of noncombat activities of the United States Army: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF NORA B. KENNEDY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3430) for the relief of the estate of Nora B. Kennedy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Nora B. Kennedy, late of South Boston, Mass., the sum of \$10,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such estate against the United States arising out of the death of the said Nora B. Kennedy, which occurred as a result of her being struck by a United States Army vehicle on December 31, 1944, while she was crossing D Street near the intersection of Third Street in South Boston: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "of" strike out everything up to the colon on page 2, line 1, and insert in lieu thereof the following: "\$5,000, and to pay Mrs. Ann R. Norton the sum of \$1,500. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of Nora B. Kennedy, deceased, and for personal injuries and expenses incident thereto sustained by Mrs. Ann R. Norton which occurred as a result of an accident during which they were struck by a United States Army vehicle on December 31, 1944, while they were crossing D Street near the intersection of Third Street in South Boston, Mass."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of the estate of Nora B. Kennedy, deceased, and Mrs. Ann R. Norton."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL D. BANNING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3891) for the relief of Paul D. Banning, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. TRIMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a similar Senate bill, S. 1438, for the relief of Paul D. Banning, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, and for other purposes, be substituted for the House bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the Senate bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there be hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$2,625.40 of which amount (a) not to exceed the sum of \$1,641.41 shall be credited in the accounts of Paul D. Banning, chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, not to exceed the sum of \$207.68 shall be credited in the accounts of E. J. Brennan, former chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department; and not to exceed the sum of \$416.31 shall be credited in the accounts of Guy F. Allen, former chief disbursing officer, Treasury Department, such credits being allowed to adjust certain overdrafts in such accounts; and (b) not to exceed the stated sums shall be paid to the following-named employees of the Bureau of Internal Revenue in reimbursement for amounts paid by them from their personal funds on account of counterfeited bills and notes accepted by them while in the discharge of their official duties: J. W. Bell; Florence Brown; Rosamond H. Cross; Charles F. DeLisle; William H. Franz; Edward N. Fuller; Raymond C. Hein; Estelle V. Laisch; Mrs. Mae Mohn; Mrs. Charlotte Parmentier; Carolyn E. Phipps; Arthur T. Schroeder; Joseph F. Schuler; Margaret T. Sennott; Florence Stetter; Lenora Willsey, \$10 each; F. H. Bowden, Jr.; Gertrude J. Davis; Mary S. Donovan; Helen Keegan; Arthur J. Loucks; Helen M. Pletzcker; Dorothy Baron Rich; J. L. Schrum, \$20 each; and Harriet Ann Duke, \$40.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider and a similar House bill were laid on the table.

GEORGE S. PASCHKE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3966) for the relief of George S. Paschke.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to George S. Paschke, of Bremerton, Wash., the sum of \$1,668.34. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said George S. Paschke against the United States

for loss of wages, crops, and personal property, and for medical expenses, resulting from his wrongful imprisonment by the United States Army from May 23, 1946, to June 7, 1946: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WALTER M. SMITH

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4226) for the relief of Walter M. Smith.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$112.15 to Walter M. Smith, of 72 Chittenden Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, in full settlement of all claims against the United States as reimbursement for expenses incurred in travel from Columbus, Ohio, to Riverton, Wyo., and return, on instructions from Bureau of Reclamation, Department of the Interior, in the month of June 1948: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 per centum thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MAUD M. WRIGHT AND MRS. MAXINE ROBERTS, FORMERLY MRS. MAXINE MILLS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4246) for the relief of Mrs. Maud M. Wright and Mrs. Maxine Roberts, formerly Mrs. Maxine Mills.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Maud M. Wright, Robinson, Ill., the sum of \$7,500, and to Mrs. Maxine Roberts, formerly Mrs. Maxine Mills, Robinson, Ill., the sum of \$7,500. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States of the said Mrs. Maud M. Wright for the death of her husband, Orin C. Wright, on January 21, 1944, and of the said Mrs. Maxine Roberts, formerly Mrs. Maxine Mills, for the death of her former husband, Charles W. Mills, on January 22, 1944, both of whom died as the result of burns sustained in a fire at the Evans Hall housing project, Evansville, Ind., which was under the supervision and management of the National Housing Agency, the United States Court of Claims (Cong. No. 17850, decided March 6, 1951, pursuant to S. Res. 227, 80th Cong.) having found that the United States was negligent in failing to

enforce its safety regulations, and that such failure was the proximate cause of the deaths: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$7,500" and insert "\$5,000."

Page 1, line 7, strike out \$7,500" and insert "\$5,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN S. DOWNING

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4269) for the relief of John S. Downing.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John S. Downing, of Fayetteville, N. C., the sum of \$327.75. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said John S. Downing against the United States for compensation for services performed between March 26, 1949, and May 12, 1949 (both dates inclusive, as United States Commissioner for the eastern district of North Carolina: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

STEFAN LENARTOWICZ AND HIS WIFE, IRENE

The Clerk called the bill (S. 360) for the relief of Stefan Lenartowicz and his wife, Irene.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Stefan Lenartowicz and his wife, Irene, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 10, after the word "proper", strike out the balance of the line, all of line

11 and line 1 on page 2 and insert the following: "quota officer to deduct two numbers from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SUI KEN FONG AND SUI TUNG FONG

The Clerk called the bill (S. 417) for the relief of Sui Ken Fong and Sui Tung Fong.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the minor children, Sui Ken Fong and Sui Tung Fong, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Soo Wing Fong, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BETTY MINORU KAWACHI

The Clerk called the bill (S. 915) for the relief of Betty Minoru Kawachi.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall not apply to Betty Minoru Kawachi, the minor child of Mrs. James J. Leatherman, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF SIDNEY LOMAX

The Clerk called the bill (S. 536) for the relief of the estate of Sidney Lomax, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of Sidney Lomax, deceased, the sum of \$5,000 in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for the death of the said Sidney Lomax, who died as a result of injuries received when he was struck by a United States Army truck in Starkville, Miss., on November 27, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRADY FRANKLIN WELCH

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1109) for the relief of Grady Franklin Welch.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay to Grady Franklin Welch, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$450, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for attorney's fees paid by him, the said Welch, to his attorney of record in the case of United States against Welch, criminal number 10200, District Court of the United States for the Eastern District of Virginia, Norfolk Division: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PHILIP J. HINCKS

The Clerk called the bill (S. 1113) for the relief of Philip J. Hincks.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Philip J. Hincks, of Middlebury, Vt., the sum of \$150. The payment of such sum shall be in full payment of all claims of the said Philip J. Hincks against the United States for reimbursement of money paid for uniforms which were required during his training as a midshipman at the United States Naval Reserve Midshipman's School, Chicago, Ill.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROY F. WILSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 796) for the relief of Roy F. Wilson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Roy F. Wilson, of Burlington, Iowa, the sum of \$336.17, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for travel allowance from Paris, France, to Burlington, Iowa, incident to his discharge from the Army of the United States on November 23, 1948: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon

conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$336.17" and insert "\$330.25."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read the third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOSEPH A. FERRARI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3026) for the relief of Joseph A. Ferrari.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joseph A. Ferrari, Dorchester, Mass., the sum of \$368.50. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Joseph A. Ferrari for reimbursement for personal property which he lost when the steamship *Antoine Saugrain* was sunk by enemy action on December 5, 1944, while transporting the said Joseph A. Ferrari and other members of the Armed Forces from Hollandia, New Guinea, to Leyte, Philippine Islands: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$368.50" and insert "\$333.75."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VINCENT F. LESLIE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 4456) for the relief of Vincent F. Leslie.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury, not otherwise appropriated, to Vincent F. Leslie, Washington, D. C., the sum of \$2,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for damages sustained by the said Vincent F. Leslie on account of his arrest and imprisonment at Jacksonville, Fla., by and at the request of United States Post Office Department inspectors on July 3, 1926, and again on July 8, 1926, and his ensuing confinement in jail until the dismissal of the prosecution against him: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction

thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

KIYOKO MATSUO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 608) for the relief of Kiyoko Matsuo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the provisions of the immigration laws relating to exclusion from the United States of aliens inadmissible because of race shall not apply to Kiyoko Matsuo, Japanese fiancée of Martin Boyer, Lancaster, Ohio, a United States citizen. The said Kiyoko Matsuo shall be eligible for a visa as a nonimmigrant temporary visitor for a period of 3 months if the appropriate administrative authorities find that she is coming to the United States with a bona fide intention of marrying the said Martin Boyer and that she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. If such marriage does not occur within 3 months after her entry, the said Kiyoko Matsuo shall be required to depart from the United States and upon failure to do so shall be deported under sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C., secs. 155 and 156). If such marriage occurs within 3 months after her entry, the Attorney General shall record the lawful admission of the said Kiyoko Matsuo to the United States for permanent residence, as of the date of her entry, upon payment by her of the required fees and head tax.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. SHIZUKO YAMANE

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 644) for the relief of Mrs. Shizuko Yamane.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding any provision of law excluding from admission to the United States persons of races ineligible to citizenship, Mrs. Shizuko Yamane, Japanese wife of Kanichi John Yamane, a citizen of the United States, and the mother of three United States citizen children, shall be admitted to the United States for permanent residence upon application hereafter filed and without presenting an immigration visa or other travel documents, if she is otherwise admissible under the immigration laws. Upon the admission of the said Mrs. Shizuko Yamane to the United States for permanent residence, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the Japanese quota for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, Mrs. Shizuko Yamane, the wife of Kanichi John Yamane, a United States citizen, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the

third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WLADIMIR PETER LEWICKI ET AL.

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 744) for the relief of Wladimir Peter Lewicki, Mrs. Heedwige Lewicki, and George Wladimir Lewicki.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Wladimir Peter Lewicki, Mrs. Heedwige Lewicki (his wife), and George Wladimir Lewicki (their son), who entered the United States for a temporary stay, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence upon payment of visa fees and head taxes. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota control officer to make appropriate deductions from the immigration quota or quotas to which such aliens are properly chargeable.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Wladimir Peter Lewicki, Mrs. Heedwige Lewicki, and George Wladimir Lewicki shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct three numbers from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

WILLEM SMITS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 982) for the relief of Willem Smits.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, Willem Smits shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted into the United States for permanent residence as of November 30, 1947, the date of his last entry into the United States.

Sec. 2. Upon enactment of this act, the Secretary of State is authorized and directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the nonpreference category of the first available immigration quota for nationals of Holland.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Willem Smits shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one

number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GEORGE CRISAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1454) for the relief of George Crisan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration and naturalization laws, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of George Crisan as of September 17, 1949, the date he lawfully entered the United States, upon the payment by him of the required visa fee and head taxes.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for Rumania of the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, George Crisan shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953)."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HANOI SARAPANOVSKI

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1598) for the relief of Hanoh Sarapanovski.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, the Attorney General be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to record the lawful admission for permanent residence of Hanoh Sarapanovski as of April 4, 1950, the date on which he entered the United States at San Antonio, Tex., upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 2. Upon the enactment of this act the Secretary of State is directed to instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Hanoh Sarapanovski, also known as Hanoh Charat, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to

Hanoh Sarapanovski the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953).

"SEC. 2. That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Gizela (Gizele) Sarapanovski (nee Levy) and Philippe Sarapanovski shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Hanoh Sarapanovski (also known as Hanoh Charat), Gizela (Gizele) Sarapanovski (nee Levy) and Philippe Sarapanovski."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HOSHI KAZUO

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1920) for the relief of Hoshi Kazuo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall not apply to Hoshi Kazuo, half-Japanese minor child in the care of Sgt. John B. Humbert and Mrs. Thelma Humbert, citizens of the United States. For the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, the said Hoshi Kazuo shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien child of the said Sgt. John B. Humbert and the said Mrs. Thelma Humbert.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIANNE AND MICHEL SPEELMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2498) for the relief of Marianne and Michel Speelman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purpose of the immigration and naturalization laws, Marianne and Michel Speelman, of New York, N. Y., who were admitted into the United States on temporary visas, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon the payment of the required visa fee and head tax.

SEC. 2. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the number of displaced persons who shall be granted the status of permanent residence pursuant to section 4 of the Displaced Persons Act, as amended (62 Stat. 1011; 64 Stat. 219; 50 U. S. C. App. 1953).

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 9, strike out "visa fee and head tax" and insert "visa fees and head taxes."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MARIA THERESA STANCOLA

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2514) for the relief of Maria Theresa Stancola.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, in the administration of the immigration laws, the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended (8 U. S. C., sec. 136 (e)), shall not hereafter apply to Mrs. Maria Theresa Stancola, German wife of Joseph J. Stancola, a United States citizen serving in the United States Armed Forces, with respect to any conviction or admission of the commission of any crime in her case of which the Department of State and the Department of Justice have knowledge on the date of enactment of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, notwithstanding the provisions of the eleventh category of section 3 of the Immigration Act of 1917, as amended, Maria Theresa Stancola may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if she is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HELEN J. LUMLEY

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2774) for the relief of Helen J. Lumley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Helen J. Lumley shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of her last entry into the United States, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Helen J. Lumley and her daughter, Kirsten-Jessen Schmidt, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fees and head taxes. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such aliens as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct two numbers from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Helen J. Lumley and Kirsten-Jessen Schmidt."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JANE AND MARTHA CLARK

The Clerk called the bill (H. H. 3151) for the relief of Jane and Martha Clark.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of sections 4 (a) and 9 of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, and notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of that act, the minor children, Jane and Martha Clark, shall be held and considered to be the natural-born alien children of Eric B. Clark, a citizen of the United States.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ETHEL CRISTETA BERNER

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 3895) for the relief of Ethel Cristeta Berner.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Ethel Cristeta Berner who entered the United States on September 21, 1945, at San Francisco, Calif., and who currently is in a non-quota status as a student, shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted, as of such date, to the United States for permanent residence. Upon the enactment of this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the quota for the Philippine Islands for the first year such quota is available.

With the following committee amendment:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and insert the following: "That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Ethel Cristeta Berner shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT AMENDMENTS
OF 1951

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 3871) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 3871, with Mr. MILLS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. When the Committee rose on yesterday, the Clerk had read down to and including line 21 on page 2 of the bill.

If there are no amendments at this point, the Clerk will read.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN: On page 2 immediately following line 21, title I of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is hereby amended by adding the following section:

"Sec. 104. That import controls of fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, and soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products and coconuts and coconut products), peanuts, butter, cheese and other dairy products, and rice and rice products are necessary for the protection of the essential security interests and economy of the United States in the existing emergency in international relations, and no imports of any such commodity or product shall be admitted to the United States until after June 30, 1953, which would (a) impair or reduce the domestic production of any such commodity or product below present production levels, or below such higher levels as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary in view of domestic and international conditions, or (b) interfere with the orderly domestic storing and marketing of any such commodity or product, or (c) result in any unnecessary burden or expenditures under any Government price-support program."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order against the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] in support of his amendment.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield. Mr. ALBERT. I want to congratulate my colleague of the Committee on Agriculture for this amendment. I have an identical amendment at the desk, and I hope the amendments prevail.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks following the remarks of the gentleman from Minnesota.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a vital and necessary amendment to the security and economy of the United States. It simply authorizes the continuance of the present import controls of fats and oils. The amendment also includes cheese and other dairy products which are vital to our economy and for which increased domestic production is needed.

House Resolution 278, which was approved by both Houses of Congress on June 30, continue title II of the Second War Powers Act which authorized import controls on fats and oils and butter. Therefore, these controls are extended in the executive branch of the Federal Government for the month of July. If that action had not been taken by the Committee on Banking and Currency as well as the House and the other body, then the law would have expired on June 30. This would have permitted large imports of fats and oils and butter upon our domestic market to the detriment of American production.

Mr. Chairman, it is very vital to the economy of our country to encourage

abundant domestic production of fats and oils and dairy products during the present emergency. If we do not continue these powers of control over imports of these commodities, it is quite apparent that we will have a flood of fats and oils and dairy products on our domestic market coming from other countries and produced at a much lower cost than what we produce them for here in the United States.

I feel that it is vital to the security and economy of the United States to secure abundant production of fats and oils and dairy products by American farmers. This production should be encouraged by Congress and the Government, and my amendment proposes to give such encouragement.

There has been an embargo on imports of foreign butter for several years under authority of the Second War Powers Act, which law has been continued by Congress on several occasions. This law expired on June 30, but was continued for the month of July by Congress with the approval of the President.

The tariff duty on butter was reduced by the President from 14 cents to 7 cents per pound in 1949. A quota of butter imports under the reduced duty was placed at 60,000,000 pounds. This was an invitation to foreign producers of butter to ship their products to the United States. Foreign-produced butter can be laid down in our principal consuming markets, with duty and transportation paid, at from 43 cents to 55 cents per pound. The support price on butter fixed by the Department of Agriculture is 66 cents per pound. Up to the present time, the embargo on butter imports has protected domestic producers. If the embargo is not continued as proposed in my amendment, our country will be flooded with foreign butter imports, and the Department of Agriculture will be required to buy at least 100,000,000 pounds of domestic butter under the support program. This would result in another potato fiasco. The people will remember that 15,000,000 bushels of potatoes from Canada came into the United States at a price a few cents under the support price, while we were destroying potatoes produced in the United States. We do not want to go through a similar experience with butter, cheese, and other dairy products, or with fats and oils.

During the past 5 years dairy cow population has decreased around 3,000,000 head. The population of human beings in the United States has increased by more than 10,000,000 during the same period. We should have more dairy cows instead of less to provide the American people with more milk at cheaper prices. My amendment seeks to give this encouragement to American dairy farmers for the next 2 years by placing an embargo on imports of butter, cheese, and other dairy products. Unless favorable action is taken here today, and should the farmers be compelled to face foreign competition from imports many of them will sell their dairy cows for slaughter which will mean a further reduction in the supply of milk, cheese, and other dairy products for American consumers.

I have included cheese and other dairy products in my amendment. These dairy products are definitely tied into butter, and should have the same protection as to imports. Around 50,000,000 pounds of foreign-made cheese was brought into this country in 1950.

There are many kinds of cheese which have been imported from foreign countries. I want to illustrate what has happened in the case of blue—bleu—cheese. Imports of this cheese in 1950 amounted to 3,491,837 pounds. This type of foreign cheese is being sold today in the New York market at a wholesale price from 39 cents to 43 cents per pound. There are 22 American producers of blue cheese. Under prevailing milk prices it costs the American producers at least 50 cents per pound to produce blue cheese. American producers of this type of cheese cannot long survive if they are forced to meet this foreign competition. It is the intention of my amendment to place an embargo against importation of blue cheese, or any other type of cheese that is presently injuring domestic production. It is also the intention of my amendment to continue the embargo against butter imports and the other commodities or products set forth in the amendment.

The embargo as defined in the amendment will be automatic and go into operation in accordance with the three standards set forth in my proposal to the Committee of the Whole. The amendment reads as follows:

SEC. 104. That import controls of fats and oils (including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, and soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products and coconuts and coconut products), peanuts, butter, cheese, and other dairy products, and rice and rice products are necessary for the protection of the essential security interests and economy of the United States in the existing emergency in international relations, and no imports of any such commodity or product shall be admitted to the United States until after June 30, 1953, which would (a) impair or reduce the domestic production of any such commodity or product below present production levels, or below such higher levels as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary in view of domestic and international conditions, or (b) interfere with the orderly domestic storing and marketing of any such commodity or product, or (c) result in any unnecessary burden or expenditures under any Government price-support program.

The Senate of the United States has adopted the language of this amendment which is found in S. 1717, an act to amend and extend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and so forth.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Does the gentleman's amendment only seek to carry out the present law? Is it different from the present law?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is somewhat different from the present law because we have spelled out in the amendment certain commodities.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I wish the gentleman would discuss that feature of his amendment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, the amendment provides a certain yardstick that will govern the embargo provisions of this bill. In the first place, no imports of fats and oils and butter, cheese, and other dairy products will be permitted to come into this country for the next 2 years, provided (a) if such imports will impair or reduce the domestic production of any commodity or product below present production levels, or below such higher levels as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary, in view of the domestic and international conditions; or, (b) if it interferes with the orderly domestic storing and marketing of such commodities; or, (c) if it results in any unnecessary burden or expenditure under any Government support program.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman's amendment is not confined to dairy products, is it?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It is confined to all fats and oils. I will read the items in there. Import controls of fats and oils include oil-bearing material, fatty acids, and soap and soap powder—but excluding petroleum and petroleum products, coconuts, and coconut products—peanuts, butter, cheese, and other dairy products, rice and rice products. Those are the items covered.

Mr. COOLEY. Would it not be interesting to know why the committee left this provision out of this bill, since a similar provision has been in the law for quite some time?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Well, it was not in the Defense Production Act of 1950. The authority for an embargo on fats, oils, and butter was contained in the Second War Powers Act which has been continued several times under legislation from the Banking and Currency Committee of the House.

Mr. COOLEY. When did that expire?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That expired on June 30, but was continued under House Resolution 278 for another month.

Mr. COOLEY. And but for the continuing resolution, it would have already expired?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It would have already expired and those commodities would have been dumped on our market.

I introduced a bill having somewhat the same language and the same intent, on June 5, H. R. 4335, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I wrote the chairman of the committee asking for a hearing, but up to the present time a hearing has not been granted. I can readily understand that, because the committee has been so busy.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman certainly did not understand I was criticizing the committee. I merely asked

him if it would not be interesting to know why the committee did not put provisions of this kind in the bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I am sure that we do not intend to criticize the committee.

Mr. COOLEY. Is there any such provision in the bill as presented by the committee?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There is no such provision.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. We did not have any jurisdiction of the subject matter at all. We never did have. We extended it for 30 days so we could look into it. It is not in this bill because it is not the proper place for it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. When I introduced my bill on June 5, it was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency. I asked for a hearing on it.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. The gentleman has made a very fine statement. I think one other thing should be pointed out. Some of these commodities are under price supports and acreage quotas, and if a flood of imports comes in at this time the Commodity Credit Corporation's good record for the last year will be in reverse in a few days.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to elaborate on that for just a moment, because that is very vital and that is included in the amendment. In the case of butter, butter from New Zealand can be laid down in the United States at 43 cents a pound, duty and transportation paid. The support price is 66 cents a pound.

A few hundred thousand pounds of butter can break the market. The wholesale market now is about 68 cents, and with the support price at 66 this foreign butter flooding our market will cause the Department of Agriculture to buy probably 150,000,000 pounds of domestic butter at the support price.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he referred his bill to the Committee on Banking and Currency and that it is currently being considered.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the distinguished chairman.

Mr. SPENCE. Under the present law the President has control of the importation of fats and oils. The gentleman's amendment makes some material

changes in the present law. That is true, is it not?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is correct.

Mr. SPENCE. That is correct. I am sure the committee will be perfectly glad to have a hearing on this proposition and consider reporting a bill. But here comes an amendment; we have had no opportunity to study it. The first time I saw it was a few minutes ago. I think the gentleman ought to give us an opportunity to study the facts; and I want to say to the gentleman that I do not think it will take more than a day; that we will consider this proposition and give him a hearing on his bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I thank the chairman for that statement, but this is a matter of emergency. If this amendment is not passed in this bill by the end of this month our country is going to be flooded with butter and fats and oils from other countries in the world under a reduced tariff and there is only one concern in the United States who will profit by it; that is the Uni-Lever Bros., who control fats and oils throughout the world. Uni-Lever has a virtual monopoly on fats and oils supplies throughout the entire world, and we certainly do not want all of those competitive products dumped upon our market in the United States to the detriment of American producers. It will react against our entire economy.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield. Mr. LARCADE. I would like to ask the gentleman whether rice and rice products are included.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Rice and rice products are included in the bill.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield. Mr. ABBITT. Is not the gentleman's amendment word for word like the amendment adopted by the other body when it passed the act week before last?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes, this amendment, word for word, was adopted by the other body and there apparently was not much of any opposition to it because I assume that they were also interested in protecting the domestic producers in a long-range program.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield. Mr. BROOKS. Does the gentleman's amendment cover vegetable oils generally?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It covers all fats and oils; and with a large cotton crop staring us in the face, probably 16,000,000 to 19,000,000 bales you are going to have so much cottonseed oil that certainly it must be protected from imports. That also is true for soybeans and soybean oil and other fats which the Department of Agriculture is urging be produced in this country. If we do not want the Government to buy these products under the support program at the cost of hundreds of millions of dollars, then we had better pass my amendment so we can protect not only the Treasury of the United States but also the economy of the country.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has again expired.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota may proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I agree with the gentleman that we ought to extend the present law. If we can get a commitment from the chairman to have hearings on it then I think that probably will be the better way to do it, but I realize we have got to have something within 30 days, but to have a separate law is a better way to do it. I do not understand the difference between the gentleman's amendment and present law, but I think something ought to be done along this line.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If we do not do it now it will be too late to enact another law and have it passed by both bodies before the end of this month; and we certainly do not want our country to be used as a dumping ground for fats and oils and dairy products.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. MORANO. What effect would the gentleman's amendment have on butter price to consumers?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. It will protect the consumers and assure them of an adequate supply of butter and other dairy products produced in our country. Since 45 percent of our meat comes from American dairy farms, meat supplies will be increased for the consumers. It is profitable for a dairy farmer to sell his dairy cattle today for beef and that is what a lot of them are doing. That is why we have lost over 3,000,000 head. If you want to look forward a year or two from now, we better have more milk cows and protect the economy of the dairy farmers who are producing the milk, butter, and other dairy products for American consumers. The best insurance for American consumers against price increases will be to encourage more production of dairy products in the United States.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. In other words, let us give him more protection than he gets now under the parity price program?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Yes, this gives him protection from the imports that come in under a reduced duty, and under devalued foreign money.

Mr. JAVITS. It will give him more production than he has under the present price support program?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If we do not, we will have another potato fiasco here in the United States, with hundreds of millions of pounds of fats and oils and dairy products being imported into the country, and with our

Government buying it under the price-support program to hold up the price, simply providing a market for foreign production.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. When was the last time any of these products the gentleman seeks to place an embargo upon, these edible products, were imported into this country?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. This embargo has been in operation for several years under the Second War Powers Act, which expired on June 30, but was continued for 30 days in the recent resolution we passed.

Mr. MULTER. As I understand it, the gentleman has no fault to find with the laws as they exist today?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No; certainly not; but there is a question whether or not it can be administered and interpreted as a continuing proposition under the Second War Powers Act, for butter and the other products in the amendment.

Mr. MULTER. Does it not accomplish the gentleman's purpose if the present law is simply extended? In other words, we simply extend the existing law for the duration of this act?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No.

Mr. MULTER. Then we will give the gentleman a hearing on his bill and determine what changes, if any, should be made?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That will not accomplish the purpose that I seek, because the administration has decided that under the powers in the Defense Production Act they are not broad enough to take in and protect these various fats and oils and dairy products.

Mr. MULTER. I suggest we extend the existing law.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That will not do the job.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]. I have an identical amendment at the Clerk's desk. The control of imports of the type contemplated by this amendment is essential to protect the farmers and taxpayers of this country. Importations of fats and oils, including dairy products and peanuts, would seriously jeopardize the price-support program on such products. In order to maintain their prices, peanut farmers of this country have consented to the reduction of their acreage over the years. If foreign peanuts were allowed to be shipped into this country, it would mean that the Commodity Credit Corporation would probably have to buy the entire American crop. The effect of this would be disastrous for two reasons. In the first place, it would

cost the taxpayer enormous sums of money, and in the second place, its ultimate effect would be to destroy the price-support program on American produced peanuts. As a matter of fact it would probably ultimately result in bankrupting farmers who depend upon peanuts as a cash crop.

I congratulate the gentleman upon his amendment and sincerely hope that it prevails.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair inquire of the gentleman from Kentucky whether or not he withdraws his point of order against the amendment?

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my point of order.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment should be adopted. It must be perfectly obvious to all of us that separate legislation will not be enacted within the next 2 or 3 weeks and if this amendment is not adopted the law will expire and our country could be flooded with imported fats and oils.

Even while the law was in effect and embargoes were in operation, I received information to the effect that consideration was being given to the advisability of lifting the embargoes so as to permit the importation of peanuts in large quantities from Red China. This was about a year ago and upon receiving the information, I came straight to Washington where some of my colleagues met me, and we discussed the matter at great length with officials in the executive branch. We emphasized the fact that the peanut producers of our country had accepted acreage allotment and marketing quotas and had embarked upon a program which contemplated a drastic reduction in the production of peanuts. We also pointed out that our Government at that time was supporting the price of peanuts and that the Government had millions and millions of dollars invested in peanuts which had been acquired under the support program. Just how ridiculous can we be? If we are going to support the price of peanuts in this country and sustain substantial losses, how can we justify permitting the importation of large quantities of peanuts from places across the sea?

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. If this amendment is not enacted, it is entirely probable that the Commodity Credit Corporation, with taxpayers' funds, will buy the entire American peanut crop and a substantial portion of all butter and milk products produced in this country.

Mr. COOLEY. I think the gentleman is correct. I know that about a year ago we were told that there were shiploads of peanuts ready to be dumped on the market in America, and but for the fact that the embargo was not lifted, those peanuts would have come in. How do we know that tomorrow morning, or rather, at the expiration of this law, that ships might not be in our ports ready to unload large quantities of fats and oils to further depress the American market?

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. MULTER. Is it not a fact that while this embargo has been in effect that no imports of butter has come in, and the Commodity Credit Corporation did buy large quantities of domestic butter?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, under the support program, perhaps that is true. We probably will be buying peanuts, but why should we lift the embargo and flood our market with foreign oils and fats and still continue the support program?

Mr. MULTER. We are not suggesting that we lift the embargo, but the question in my mind is, How can you possibly be hurt if the existing embargo law stands, until we can have a hearing on the bill to determine whether changes in the bill should be enacted? That is the point.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, the author of the bill.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The solicitor for the Department of Agriculture has stated that the existing law will only apply to linseed oil and rice. Those are the only two commodities to which he can make it applicable. And, I might say further, that on June 30, before this continuing act was passed, the Department had prepared an order putting the existing law as provided in the Defense Production Act into operation covering only imports on linseed oil and rice.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, permit me to read from the law. With all due deference to the gentleman, he just cannot read what it says when he gives you the opinion he quoted: Fats, edible oils, including oil-bearing materials, fatty acids, butter, soap and soap powder, but excluding petroleum and petroleum products and coconut products.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is right.

Mr. COOLEY. That is the law the gentleman wants to extend.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And rice and rice products. They have ruled down in the Department that they must come in under the Defense Production Act and not under the War Powers Act, and under either act they have ruled that it was not particularly in the interest of defense production for them to include other fats and oils and butter. Now, they were before our committee, and that was the ruling their counsel made.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has again expired.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield further, the law that I am talking about that we are suggesting should be extended is the same

law that we extended a few days ago when we included rent control in the Defense Production Act, and specifically this very Fats and Oil Embargo Act we are talking about is chapter 426 of Public Law 591.

Mr. COOLEY. How long was it extended?

Mr. MULTER. Until the end of this month.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right, and the gentleman knows full well that if we do not take action here and now it will never be extended past the first of August, and on the second of August our market could very well be flooded.

Mr. MULTER. I agree with that, but let us extend this law as it is now, and then decide what changes, if any, must be made in this law.

Mr. COOLEY. In other words, as I understand it, the gentleman is willing to accept an extending amendment, an amendment the effect of which would be to extend existing law.

Mr. MULTER. Exactly.

Mr. COOLEY. The gentleman from Minnesota should be able to discuss that more intelligently than I could, because he knows the real difference between his amendment and existing law.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COOLEY. Yes, of course I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have already stated the attitude of the Department of Agriculture and their counsel on this matter, so that either under the Second War Powers Act, to which the gentleman has referred, or under any provision of the Defense Production Act, they say it will not be made applicable to anything but linseed oil and rice. That is all that is necessary, because it is all in the interest of defense production and the security of the country. I have tied into mine the economy of the country. I do not know, and I have no way to determine, how the administrators or the lawyers down in the administration are going to act, so I do not think the gentleman and I can say here how they will interpret a law, but I do know that they came before our Committee on Agriculture and stated that, and they threw out dairy products and they threw out the other fats and oils. So this amendment was perfected, and they saw it, and they agreed that this would accomplish the result for which I have offered it, and it has been adopted in the Senate.

Mr. MULTER. My suggestion is, let us extend the existing law and either the gentleman's Committee on Agriculture or the Committee on Banking and Currency can consider it and hold hearings. Our chairman says it should not take more than a day. Then we can find out what changes you need, if you need any.

Mr. COOLEY. The situation is that we must act now.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Andresen amendment, for what I consider very good and sufficient reasons.

This Nation produces annually around 10,000,000,000 pounds of fats and oils. Because of that great production we have had in this Nation more fats and oils than the American people could consume. Because of that the price of lard has been about 50 percent of the

should have been over the period of the past 4 or 5 years.

When a packer buys a hog, he knows before he even buys the hog that he is going to lose on the lard, so he must raise the price of pork chops in order to make up that difference. So when people buy the pork chops, they must pay a higher price than they would pay if lard was at its proper price level.

Here are some more facts the Members from the large industrial centers should take into consideration before they vote on this amendment. Labor draws in wages a little over \$4 for every dollar the farmer takes in. Industry sells on an average a little over \$4 worth of goods for every dollar the farmer takes in. So when you reduce the farm income you reduce by at least fourfold the amount that labor will draw in wages, and by over fourfold the amount the business man will sell in goods. So it affects the whole economy of the Nation.

Every raw product comes from the soil or the seed.

Seventy percent of the working people of America are employed in some phase of growing, transporting, processing and wholesaling and retailing farm products.

If the farmer does not get sufficient pay for those products, every man, woman and child in America suffers. It must also be remembered that since we mechanized our farms over the past 25 years, the national income averages almost exactly seven times our farm income. So it is not only for the benefit of the farmer that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] has offered his amendment, but it is for the benefit of every American.

I hope that the Representatives from the industrial sections of the country will recognize these facts and that farming is the basic industry of the country. We have always had a depression in this Nation when farm prices were too low, and we have always had prosperous times when farm prices were at fairly high level as is the case today and when we argue that we should have beef roll-backs, for instance, we must realize that those roll-backs will cost the American farmer many hundreds of millions of dollars and in turn they will cost the laboring man and industry fourfold more than the farmer will suffer as a result of such roll-backs.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I take this time because I think this amendment is serious enough to justify a great deal of thought and consideration. I come from a cotton-producing State. Our section depends upon cotton. Last year we had a very great shortage of cotton. The Department of Agriculture appealed to our people to plant more cotton, a great deal more cotton and to try for an all-time record in cotton production. Our farmers have gone to work this year and are producing an all-time record in the production of cotton in the South and West.

Last night I read in the paper and then again this morning I read the

articles in the paper in reference to the agricultural report on the production of cotton. I find that the cotton acreage is up 58 percent in the United States over what it was a year ago. Our farmers are planting 11,000,000 more acres of cotton this year throughout the South and West than they did the year before. The three Western States of California, Arizona, and New Mexico alone have planted an all-time record acreage in cotton, about 40 percent above the previous record year of 1949. None of us were greatly surprised last night to read the report from the Department of Agriculture showing an estimate of 17,000,000 bales of American cotton to be produced during the coming year. That is what they estimate, and I think it is a conservative estimate.

We find as a result of it that yesterday afternoon the cotton market fell \$3.10 a bale on cotton. I think that is something we ought to think about. I am not alarmed. But if cotton produces cottonseed, and from cottonseed comes cottonseed meal and oil, we should have in force a law which will permit our Government to restrict the importation of vegetable oils in competition with cottonseed oil. If there is any doubt at all about the authority, I am in favor of extending that authority. So I am in support of the amendment presently before the committee or some other amendment which will accomplish this.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. BROOKS] has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer a substitute amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPENCE:

"SEC. 104. The act of June 30, 1950, Public Law 590, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out 'July 31, 1951,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'September 30, 1952'."

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer this as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]. I think the present law has served every purpose for which it was enacted. It has protected every agricultural product that was sought to be protected.

I might say that includes peanuts. The growers of peanuts are much exercised that the law would expire and they would have no protection.

That law was considered by the Committee on Banking and Currency. It is within the jurisdiction of that committee, and that committee reported it after hearings. I realize that the farmer needs protection. While I live in an industrial section, seven of the counties I represent are as much devoted to agriculture as any county in the United States. I want to protect the farmers. I know that farming is the great basic industry of America. I know that when the farmer is not prosperous none of us is prosperous. I want to see the farmer protected. I want him to obtain the fruits of his labor. But why should we adopt an amendment, when we have had no opportunity to consider it? I am sure the gentleman from Minnesota will admit it changes the basic policy. It is a far-reaching amendment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. Not right now. It is a far-reaching amendment. We have had no opportunity to give it consideration. I had never seen it until a few minutes ago. The Senate may have adopted it, but is that any precedent for the House? I think not. If you adopt it, there will be no chance for any consultation in conference in regard to it, because I understand it is in the words of the Senate bill.

Now, why not give the Committee on Banking and Currency an opportunity to consider this matter? Why not give them an opportunity to hear witnesses on the subject, to see how far-reaching the gentleman's amendment is? I can say to the gentleman that the Committee on Banking and Currency needs no guardianship by any other committee. We are as truly interested in the welfare of the farmers of the country as any other committee of this Congress. Many of the Members on that committee have large farming sections in their districts. They do not need the guardianship or patronizing advice of any other committee. They will meet in the spirit of taking care of the farmer's interest and in taking care of his interest we will take care of the public weal.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I know the gentleman wants to be accurate.

Mr. SPENCE. Certainly.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman has stated that the Senate has adopted an amendment similar to the one he has offered.

Mr. SPENCE. No, no. Similar to the one you have offered. That is what I said was the objection to your amendment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. If my amendment is adopted, then, according to the gentleman's interpretation, it would not be in conference; it would be agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. That is correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And that is the way we want it.

Mr. SPENCE. It would be a final settlement of it without any consideration and without any hearings. I did not say that the Senate had adopted an amendment such as I have offered, but such as the one which the gentleman has offered. Therefore there is nothing to go to conference. We would finally have accepted an amendment that we had had no consideration of in the Banking and Currency Committee to whom it ought to be referred.

What is unreasonable about continuing the present act for 90 days? It is the act that was the result of hearings; it is an act that has accomplished its purpose; it is an act that has protected the farmer, and it will give us time to have a hearing on the subject. We will give the gentleman an opportunity to be heard on his bill, and we will proceed in an orderly way to arrive at a conclusion after consideration and judgment, and there is certainly nothing unreasonable in my request, and I hope the House will adopt the amendment I

have offered. I hope the House will not override the right of the Committee on Banking and Currency to consider this matter in an orderly fashion under the rules of the House and give the Members the benefit of a report which will analyze the proposal and give you all the facts.

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I feel sure every Member of the House approaches legislation and votes in the way that he feels will be for the best interest of the country. I have never been for controls, and I think it might be well for those who are asking to be shackled by controls to examine what happened under the OPA.

During the year previous to Pearl Harbor 50,000 food outlets closed their doors. Labor was scarce, and operating costs were mounting steadily, but ceiling prices were frozen under OPA.

I recall that in the first quarter of 1943 about 5,000 grocers and butchers closed their shops every month. On one day in March 1943 the New York State Retail Merchants Association recorded arrivals of 62 carloads of potatoes as compared with 143 carloads on the same day of the previous year. Oranges were 10 carloads, against 21 a year earlier; fresh peas, 1 carload against 33; spinach, 6 carloads against 26; grapefruit, 10 carloads against 26. Total cars of all fruits and vegetables on track in the New York market that day were 292, against 554 a year earlier. The same situation developed in poultry.

I recall that during 1942 the grocery manufacturers of America maintained almost daily contact in Washington with no less than 21 Federal agencies—certificates, amendments, special orders, interpretations, from OPA, WPB, FSA, BLS, FCA, FDA, FWA, OCD, OLLA, USI, and ODHWS.

In February 1943 the Byrd committee reported to the Senate that in a period of 6 months the OPA had "issued and requested statistical data on 7,715,229 report forms, exclusive of rationing forms and instructions." Yet OPA, in that period, was only one of 48 Federal agencies sending out questionnaires to businessmen.

The OPA topped the list with 1,096 different forms.

I recall definitely that in October 1943, when butter was unobtainable in several large cities, and available only in quarter-pound lots generally, an official report showed 221 million pounds of butter impounded in cold storage by the Federal Government, about 6.7 pounds for each of the 33,000,000 families in the United States. Worst of all, much of this butter had been in storage so long it was unfit for human consumption.

I am sure that many Members will recall the report submitted to the House of Representatives in November 1943 covering nonrecoverable losses in Government-owned food spoilage. This report included 2,739,000 pounds of dried beans and peas which had become mouldy and weevil-infested; 295,000 pounds of wheat cereal; 234,620 pounds of strawberry preserves, mouldy; 113,083 pounds of canned salmon—rusty cans;

121,600 pounds of potatoes—old stock; 138,750 pounds of fresh onions—decayed; 69,804 pounds of canned tomatoes—spoiled; 74,064 pounds of canned peaches—rusty cans.

Another list carried items spoiled but partially salvageable. This list included 1,939,000 pounds of rolled oats, damaged by rodents; 47,420 pounds of canned chicken; 240,000 pounds of canned salmon; 102,700 pounds of mouldy beans.

At Zanesville, Ohio, 30 carloads of evaporated milk were on hand at least 3 months on Government account when the cans began to explode.

Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what you are rushing into now under these controls. Memories are short. In less than 11 years the people have forgotten apparently the turmoil and shortages due to OPA. Now we propose to repeat that history and I am against it.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to correct my amendment by striking out "August 1, 1951," and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1952."

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the requisite number of words.

Mr. Chairman, I am sorry that the gentleman from Minnesota has objected. An amendment can be prepared and offered to make it 12 months, and I hope it will be accepted.

I am not saying that the gentleman from Minnesota is wrong, I do not know, but in the interest of orderly procedure and good judgment in legislation and acting in a manner that we should act with discretion, it occurs to me that the safe way is not to adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] and make it a part of this bill. If we do, it is cemented in the law then and there is nothing in conference to talk about, there is no area of disagreement between the two Houses. As I stated, it is sealed in the law. The gentleman from Minnesota wants it that way. Well, I suppose if we understood it like the gentleman from Minnesota possibly we would feel the same way. But we do not understand it that way.

We have not had any hearings on this matter, it has been given no consideration. The chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency offers to give it immediate consideration after this bill is out of the way. Then we will hear the gentleman from Minnesota and if he is right we will be on his side and will report a bill out.

The amendment offered by the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency is to extend the present law for 60 days after expiration, which in practice will mean 90 days. He asked unanimous consent to extend the present law, in effect, for 12 months, but the gentleman from Minnesota objected to that. I do not see why he objected but he did object.

An amendment will undoubtedly be offered to amend the substitute offered

by the gentleman from Kentucky to make it 12 months. Certainly no one can object to that. Then the two will go to conference, the existing law and the Senate amendment as proposed by the gentleman from Minnesota. The conferees in that area of disagreement will have something to work on. If there is something being done that is not in the public interest, it can be stopped, it can be prevented; but if you cement it in the present bill, we have no area of disagreement at all. The conferees are absolutely helpless.

I hope the gentleman will withdraw his objection to that amendment. Will not the gentleman do that?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I have been informed that when a House bill is amended, even though there is identical language in a Senate bill, it is still subject to conference.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, no; the gentleman is not correct. He has been here a long time, because I have been here 23 years. I believe the gentleman has been here that long.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. A little longer than that.

Mr. PATMAN. A little longer; yes.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The Parliamentarian has advised me that when the House amends its own bill, even though there is a similar provision in the Senate bill, and we do not amend the Senate bill, that it is subject to amendment.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, that is in the shadow of trickery, and we are not going to work any trickery here.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I do not engage in that kind of trickery.

Mr. PATMAN. And we do not want to be compelled to do it to protect the public interest. So save us from a situation where we might be constrained to do something against the rules to protect the public interest. Let us fix this thing so that there will be an area of disagreement, and then if the gentleman is right he should not object, because right will prevail.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. COOLEY. It is difficult for me to understand how the Committee on Banking and Currency can suggest that the committee is taken by surprise by this amendment in view of the fact that the House of Representatives inserted almost a similar provision in the stop-gap legislation which continued the operation for an additional 30 days.

Mr. PATMAN. Well, that gives us some time to study it. We have plenty of time.

Mr. COOLEY. You have already had a week's time.

Mr. PATMAN. I know, but we still have time. This is only the 10th day of July, and we have been up to the deadline a lot closer than 21 days before this.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I might say to the gentleman that I introduced a bill on June 5, and on the 6th I wrote a letter to the chairman and asked for a hearing on it, and up to this date I have not received a hearing. I know you have been busy.

Mr. PATMAN. For the obvious reason that the chairman has been conducting hearings night and day, and even Saturdays.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I understand, and I am not criticizing him for that.

Mr. PATMAN. And even the ambitious and aggressive Committee on Agriculture has not been doing that well.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. That is why it is necessary to enact this amendment as a part of this law.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. We are trying to carry out the intention that you have in your mind. Today we are offering an amendment to amend the present bill. Now, that goes to conference. That gives us an opportunity to investigate without a formal hearing, and certainly it is fair, and I hope you will not object to this amendment. That goes to conference, and if we are convinced that your amendment is better than the present law, we will accept it. You certainly are entitled to some kind of a hearing, and I ask the Members to vote for this amendment to the existing law, not that we do not want to have a hearing, but we will find out from some witnesses if the present law is better for the people of the country. I think this is a fair solution, and I think you ought to go along with it, because we are trying to help you out.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I have read the Andresen amendment and I have read the committee substitute. The Andresen amendment speaks of cheese and cheese products. Is that included under the present law, or is that a new one?

Mr. PATMAN. That is another thing we do not know about in other words, we are legislating in the dark.

Mr. JAVITS. If it is a new one, I think that puts a different light on the situation.

Mr. PATMAN. I think the gentleman will admit that some commodities are included that are not in the present law.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I stated that in my statement.

Mr. PATMAN. Each one is a basic commodity. We do not know how far it will go.

Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the Spence substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. PATMAN to the substitute offered by Mr. SPENCE:

"SEC. 104. The act of June 30, 1950, Public Law 590, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, is hereby amended by striking out 'August 1,

1951,' and inserting in lieu thereof 'July 1, 1952.'"

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, this is offered in view of the fact that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], did not see fit to permit the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] to amend his own amendment accordingly. As far as the Committee on Banking and Currency is concerned, I think the impression has been left that we are not looking after the farmers. I desire to invite your attention to the fact that the Committee on Banking and Currency has a record of going so far in the interest of the farmers that by unanimous consent we lowered the parity law one time. When the first Price Control Act was passed by Congress the latter part of 1941 or early part of 1942, January 8, I believe it was, when it became law, we had a provision inserted by the Banking and Currency Committee providing for 110 percent of parity. Now, no other committee of Congress ever did that well for the farmers. We went too far. We went so far we had to go back and lower it. So our committee has not been on the side of being stingy with the farmers, we have been on the side of being generous with the farmers.

Our committee is composed of Representatives from farming districts just like most of the other committees of this House. We have the interest of agriculture at heart just like any other committee of this House. We yield to no committee of this House in our interest in and appreciation of the farmers of the country. We want to do what is necessary to keep them prosperous, recognizing, as has been said here, that if the farmers are not prosperous the country is not prosperous. We must maintain a sound, prosperous agriculture. We all realize that. Now I want to appeal to the Members of the House if this is not absolutely sound.

We have before our committee now a bill to amend the present act on imports of fats and oils, to extend it for 1 year. We have not had an opportunity to hold hearings on that bill by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] because it involves other commodities. The gentleman here admits it involves other commodities than the present law. We want to hear the testimony on it. We do not want to act in the dark. We have plenty of time. We have 21 days. The chairman has promised a hearing immediately after this bill passes. A promise from the gentleman from Kentucky means it will be done. He is a man of honor, a man of integrity. No one ever questions his word. He has told us we are going to have that hearing. Then if the gentleman from Minnesota can make a case for the additional commodities we will be on his side. We will report his bill. But if he does not, we will not, we will report the present law just as it is. So why not pass this extension of 12 months, and then it will be in the House bill. The other bill in the Senate, meeting us half way, contains a proposal advanced by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] just exactly as he has put it in this

bill. Then we will have an area of disagreement. If there is anything wrong about the Andresen matter we can do something about it. If it is all right, we can agree to the Senate provision. But if you accept the Andresen amendment now you have cemented it in the bill and there is no way on earth for the conferees to change the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t." It has to remain exactly that way.

It does not seem to me like that is the right way to legislate. If there are two ways to do something and one is a good, safe, reasonable way and the other is uncertain, let us do it the reasonable way.

This Andresen amendment embraces commodities the present law does not embrace. We are willing to have a hearing on the additional commodities. The chairman says so. We do not object to that. But let us extend the present law now, and then meet with the Senate conferees and do what is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Andresen amendment.

Mr. Chairman, you do not need to try and convince something is wrong, and uncertain about this language we have in the Andresen amendment. It is very plain, fair and constructive. It states that import controls of fats and oils, peanuts, butter, cheese, and other dairy products, and rice and rice products are necessary for the protection of the essential security interests and economy of the United States in the existing emergency in international relations.

If it is necessary for national defense to bring those things in, I have no objection to bringing them in. But the Andresen amendment also states this, and this is where the certainty and the protection come in:

No imports of any such commodity or product shall be admitted to the United States until after June 30, 1953, which would impair or reduce the domestic production of any such commodity or product below present production levels, or below such higher levels as the Secretary of Agriculture may deem necessary in view of domestic and international conditions.

Why do you want to bring in imports which will upset the program of our domestic production at present levels or higher levels if the Department of Agriculture says we need those higher levels of production? Higher levels should be protected. That is what the gentleman wants to do. He wants to protect our present production and higher production if necessary—to do what? To accomplish the main purpose of the law. Where is there anything wrong in that? Why does the Committee on Banking and Currency want to further consider that proposition?

That is just cold-blooded Americanism, and that is what we want in this proposition. If these imports interfere with the orderly domestic storing and marketing of any such commodity or products they must not come in until 1953. What is wrong with that? Do you want to upset the domestic storing activities? Do you want to upset the marketing activities of our domestic procedure? If you do not want to upset

those things, then adopt the Andresen amendment.

Now, the third and last proposition—if these imports result in any unnecessary burden or expenditure in any Government price-support program, they must not come here until 1953. What is wrong with that?

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. And we are supporting oil-producing commodities such as peanuts and cottonseed.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Certainly. When you vote against this amendment you will vote to defeat your idea and to destroy your own program. I am sure we do not need any further time to consider that sort of proposition. We should adopt this amendment.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Under the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], the Government must own the commodities and own the fats and oils in the support program before this would go into operation.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. At the present time the Government does not own any of these fats and oils and all this does is to seek to stop the Government from being put in a position of having to buy these fats and oils; and, in other words, to save the taxpayers' money.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct. This is protection all the way through.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. ALBERT. The Commodity Credit Corporation sent me a letter this morning stating they had reduced their inventories over a billion dollars, I believe, and this will add that billion dollars back to their inventories if the commodities come, because the Commodity Credit Corporation, under the law, is bound to buy American-produced products if there is no other market for them.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is correct. They have to do it.

Mr. ALBERT. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. This will save money for the taxpayers and protect American agriculture at the same time.

Mr. BELCHER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. BELCHER. Can the gentleman tell us why the Committee on Banking and Currency would need to hold hearings to determine whether or not we should permit imports into the United States of products at the very time that the Government of the United States is spending he taxpayers' money to support that market?

Mr. CRAWFORD. And which imports would upset this program? Of course they do not need any hearings on that.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. CELLER. Has the gentleman considered the impact this amendment would have on our relations with other countries with whom we have reciprocal trade agreements, and the ECA countries?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now, wait a minute, if we are going to upset the domestic production of any commodity or upset the orderly domestic storing activities which will result in any unnecessary burden of expenditure on Government price-support programs, in order to protect the reciprocal trade-agreements program—if we are going to go that far, we might as well kick American agriculture in the pants and tell them to go rustle for themselves.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield.

Mr. COOLEY. We have had almost the same provision in the law and there has been no complaint about any conflict with reciprocal trade treaties.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is right, the only difference is that we have had one or two more products added.

Mr. COOLEY. That is right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. We want to adopt the Andresen amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I will not take any more time than is necessary, but I think a word or two ought to be said to clear up the situation. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], and myself have offered an amendment to the bill to take care of import licensing. The chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency has introduced a substitute amendment which would carry on the present law for another year. The present law is not sufficient to adequately meet the situation. There are only two instances in which imports of these commodities can be stopped. First, the President must find that such controls are essential to the acquisition or distribution of products in world short supply. That does not help relieve the situation at all. That applies to commodities in short supply. Second, essential to the orderly liquidation of temporary surpluses. That does not meet our situation. So to adopt the substitute will not meet the situation at all.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to stress what the gentleman has said, that before the amendment offered by the chairman of the committee [Mr. SPENCE] or by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] goes into effect, the Government must have these surpluses. At the present time the Government does not have these surpluses of these commodities. Our amendment seeks to prevent the Government from getting them, in order to have orderly marketing in this country. So on fats and oils and dairy products the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr.

SPENCE] will not prevail, and imports will come into the United States.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. SPENCE. The gentleman comes from a peanut-growing section of the country.

Mr. ABBITT. Yes.

Mr. SPENCE. Have not peanuts been taken care of under the present act?

Mr. ABBITT. Peanuts have been taken care of.

Mr. SPENCE. Has not butter been taken care of? What agricultural product has not been taken care of under the present act?

Mr. ABBITT. The only answer I can give the gentleman is that when this matter came up and it looked like controls would expire on June 30, our very efficient chairman called a conference of members of the committee interested in this matter. We have certain people from the Department of Agriculture, and they told us then that under the present law it was doubtful if they protect our products.

Mr. SPENCE. Because the act was about to expire. Was that not the reason?

Mr. ABBITT. No, sir. They said that under the language there had to be two things. There must either be a short supply or it must be essential to the orderly liquidations of temporary surpluses.

Mr. SPENCE. What agricultural product has not been taken care of at the present time?

Mr. ABBITT. I cannot tell the gentleman.

Mr. SPENCE. They have all been taken care of. The act is very wide in its scope. I have heard no complaints from all of the people who are producing oils and fats, butter and butter products. They knew that it protected them.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Is it not a fact that since the war there have been in the Commodity Credit Corporation storehouse surpluses of these commodities, and therefore the provisions of the law were necessarily put into effect; whereas at the present time those surpluses have been reduced and we are putting ourselves in the position of making it impossible to operate this law, by reason of the fact that this condition is no longer present?

Mr. ABBITT. The gentleman is exactly right. Last year we had about 10,000,000 bales of cotton. There was a short supply. The same was true of all these other things.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ABBITT. I yield.

Mr. BROWN of Georgia. I understand the gentleman himself introduced a bill along this line. What is the difference between the gentleman's bill and the present law and the Andresen amendment?

Mr. ABBITT. I introduced a bill continuing the present law, with an added amendment, which takes care of the situation to which the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT] referred.

Mr. COOLEY. Will the gentleman read that amendment?

Mr. ABBITT. "Essential to the orderly marketing of commodities under price control or diversion program." But that is not in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE]. Unless we have that added to the present law or our amendment we might just as well not have any law, so far as keeping out these products is concerned at the present time.

First. These are abnormal times in which we find ourselves, and many of the adjustments which were set in motion after the cessation of hostilities in World War II will not have been completed by the time the current law expires. Specifically, adjustments are still being made with respect to the peanut program and while impressive progress has been made toward bringing supplies into line with demand, I am reliably informed that the CCC, on the basis of estimated yields this year, might very well lose over \$3,500,000 on peanuts. Certainly we are not justified in adding to this burden by stimulating the importation of peanuts at the time when a Government agency is doing everything within its power to bring supplies into line with demand.

There is nothing unfair or out of keeping with the spirit of the general agreement on trade and tariff in connection with the protection of our domestic peanut industry. Fundamentally, the United States is producing peanuts for edible market in the United States. Practically all of the remaining production of peanuts throughout the world is for oil on a much lower-priced market. By opening our domestic edible market to foreign produced peanuts we are providing foreign producers with a high priced edible market for which their nuts were not originally produced. The current acreage adjustment program with respect to peanuts in the United States provides for determining yields on a 5-year average basis. Over a period of time such a basis has proven to be acceptable and sound. However, it does mean that in a period such as we are encountering now, it does not fully reflect probable yields. Accordingly, it will take a little more time to properly bring supply into line with demand in this country.

Second. I understand the CCC still holds in excess of 500,000 pounds of linseed oil at an aggregate cost of approximately \$146,000,000, which is the carry-over from the production of flaxseed in World War II. Additional time is needed for orderly reduction of these stocks.

The two main sources from which we could expect importation of flaxseed, which would interfere with the orderly marketing of this commodity which was acquired under price support, are Argentina and Canada. While it is true that supplies in the Argentine have been reduced materially, they have increased their acreage this year approximately

1,500,000 acres, which amounts to a 50-percent increase in acreage. There is little doubt but what many circumstances and forces would operate to bring a substantial portion of Argentine production into this country unless controlled.

Last year Canada had a short flax crop. There is no indication that last year's short Canadian crop will be repeated this year.

Third. The present market in the United States for rice is sufficiently high that it would tend to draw supplies from far-eastern markets to the United States at a time when food which is produced in the Far East should be kept in that area. In view of the current unsettled times, it is quite obvious that we should take steps now to see that the necessary legislation is passed to protect the gains we have already made in solving our agricultural adjustment problems.

Fourth. For those of you who believe that this proposal is sufficiently covered by the Defense Production Act of 1950, let me explain that the law is not sufficiently clear to say with absolute certainty that the Defense Production Act of 1950 will be interpreted to permit the control of imports such as we have in mind. Accordingly, I urge you to pass this legislation and leave no doubt as to the intention of the Congress.

Fifth. The Department of Agriculture has very strongly urged that the cotton producers of the United States increase their production from 10,000,000 bales in 1950 to 16,000,000 bales in 1951. The present prospects indicate that the American farmer has responded to this appeal and will not only meet the goal of 16,000,000 bales, but probably will exceed it. This will result in the production of huge quantities of cottonseed oil. It is patently absurd for the Congress of the United States to say to the cotton grower: "You should increase your production of cotton, and incidentally cottonseed, and at the same time while you are increasing your production in response to our needs, we are going to aid and abet the lowering of the price you will receive for the cottonseed by opening up importation of fats and oils which are not needed in this country, but are very definitely needed in the countries from which they would be exported to this country."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT] has expired.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, that we have members on both sides of the Committee on Agriculture who seem to be satisfied that the Andresen amendment should be adopted. I think that it is best that we do take this language the Senate has adopted, for by so doing we can cement it into law, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has so well stated, though he does not approve of such action. Personally, I want to cement it into law. I do not want the President to have the opportunity to veto the same restrictions as to imports of competing farm products, and he would have that opportunity if we followed the advice of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] and the gentleman from Texas

[Mr. PATMAN] and attempted to reenact the present law. Let us express the will of the House today and legislate as we feel is right. I have every confidence in the members of the Committee on Agriculture and in my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN], who has always worked hard for the best interests of our dairy farmers. Why in the name of common sense should we, on the one hand, spend huge sums to support farm commodity prices and then, on the other hand, open our Nation's doors wide to competing products produced by cheap labor?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield that I may ask a question of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. ABBITT]?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. In response to the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE], when he asked what farm products are not protected, as I understood the gentleman's presentation none of them are protected unless they fit into those two categories which the gentleman enumerated.

Mr. ABBITT. That is exactly right.

Mr. CRAWFORD. So the answer to the question of the gentleman from Kentucky is that none are protected unless that amendment is put in.

Mr. ABBITT. That is right; as was pointed out so well by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. ALBERT], we no longer have these circumstances, so we will not be protected.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In conclusion, let us vote down the Spence substitute and accept the Andresen amendment. Millions of farmers who produce hogs, dairy products, and flaxseed will have added incentive to work long hours and produce ample food so necessary to our Nation at this time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I strongly support this amendment by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN]. Too long and too often have the farmers of Iowa and the Nation been made the victims of foreign fats and oil imports, produced by cheap labor.

I am opposed to undermining American farmers, labor and industry through the importation of any foreign products unless there is a tariff differential representing the differential in cost of production and the American standard of living.

I will never knowingly vote for any piece of legislation that will permit Lever Bros. and the soap monopoly or any other industry in this country to purchase raw material on a cheap foreign labor market and then sell the finished product in this country at a price based on the American raw material and labor market.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment and wish to speak in opposition to the Andresen amendment.

I find on looking over the Andresen amendment that it affords no protection at all to our national defense effort. When it comes to national interest and the defense effort we are not farmers, we are not city folks, we are not in any special category except that we are all

Americans, and our first thought is and must be for the protection of this country. I am sure the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN] feels the same way, but I can find nothing in his amendment to meet the situation in which we now find ourselves, the shortage of edible fats. Fats and oils are used in many things that enter into our war effort, and we cannot let prohibition against the importation of fats and oils go to the point where it interferes with the manufacture of our war materials, and that is what the gentleman's amendment would do. There is everything in the amendment that would limit the defense efforts of the United States since we are admittedly in short supply of fats and oils. If the gentleman can show me where I am mistaken about his amendment I would be very glad to have him do so.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNON. I yield.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman feel that it is in the interest of national defense to secure an abundant production of all kinds of foods, fats, and oils?

Mr. McKINNON. I will be glad to answer this way: I think our economy wants a full production and we want to do everything we can to encourage full production; but if due to reasons beyond our control we cannot get sufficient fats and oils for the war effort, for war production, then we must be able to import them. The gentleman's amendment does not provide for that.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Oh, yes; my amendment takes care of securing an abundant production of linseed oil and other oils that go into paints. So if the gentleman is interested particularly in that angle he is going to get abundant production of those oils.

Mr. McKINNON. Will the gentleman be more specific?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Let me say further that we have seen the time in this country when the shortage of fats and oils has been so bad that we were gouged by other countries of the world in our efforts to secure raw materials for the war effort to keep up production in this country. We had to pay \$3.22 a pound for pepper and 67 cents for rubber, and other things proportionately.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I cannot conceive how pepper and rubber enter into the production of fats and oils, edible or otherwise.

I want to say simply that last year we reported this bill out and favored it because there was a surplus. There is no surplus now. In the last 12-month period flaxseed, for instance, was selling at about four times what it sold for in the 1935-39 period. If 400 percent increase is not sufficient incentive to secure the necessary production of flaxseed oil, I think we should not tie our hands on national defense by prohibiting further importation of flaxseed oil.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNON. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. The gentleman is mistaken in the price of flaxseed. The approximate price of flaxseed was \$4 per bushel. It was up to \$7 per bushel during the war. It certainly is not four times today what it was in 1935. It is about 30 percent over.

Mr. McKINNON. The Department of Agriculture reports the price of flaxseed in April of 1951 at \$4.37. In the 1935-39 average the price was \$1.69, practically four times as much. Now, if that kind of price incentive cannot produce enough flaxseed to take care of our war effort, I think our war effort comes before the protection of a few people.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. Does the gentleman think any one of these conditions in the Andresen amendment would prohibit this country from bringing into it any of these fats and oils if the defense effort should require it, and local production could not meet the demand?

Mr. McKINNON. That is the way I read it. I asked the gentleman for that clarification. I do not object to seeing that our own farm bloc gets adequate protection and incentive for production. We want to keep our domestic production high.

Mr. ALBERT. What in the amendment leads the gentleman to think that if the defense effort of the country would require imports and American agriculture could not produce it, we could not bring it in?

Mr. McKINNON. Read the amendment.

Mr. ALBERT. Where in the amendment?

Mr. McKINNON. The amendment simply says that notwithstanding the provisions of any other law the import controls on fats and oils are prohibited from coming in if it will do one of three things.

Mr. ALBERT. That is right.

Mr. McKINNON. First, will reduce the domestic production, which is a very broad thing, and, second, interfere with the orderly domestic storing, and, third, result in unnecessary burden of expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may proceed for one additional minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has referred to linseed oil. The Government itself, the Commodity Credit Corporation, owns 1 year's supply of linseed oil from a crop that it purchased 2 years ago when the Government purchased the entire crop of flaxseed in this country. They have all kinds of flaxseed. With the rest of the provisions of the bill, before they become operative, under the amendment proposed by the gentleman from Kentucky, the Government would have to

own all of these surpluses before the embargo could be put into operation. What my amendment seeks to do is to have an orderly production in this country and orderly marketing, so that the Government will not have to waste the taxpayers' money under the support program to buy fats and oils, butter, cheese, and these other items.

I hope I have made myself clear that there is an ample supply of linseed oil in this country because the United States Government owns one full year's supply of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has again expired.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, first of all I want to point out that during that year the gentleman is describing the great stockpile on the Government shelf the price of flaxseed went from \$3.68 to \$4.37. If the gentleman is willing to write into his amendment, if the war effort necessitates these fats and oils may be brought in for the protection of our country, that is one thing, but the gentleman's amendment does not provide that. There would be a great danger to our national defense and to our welfare to allow special interests to come in here, as this amendment does, and take over the defense of our country.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I would like to read the amendment.

Mr. McCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. McCARTHY. As I read the amendment, it would prevent the importation of these things, even though it is necessary to stockpile them. I can see the point of the gentleman from Minnesota, if he wants to write an amendment that will lay down certain provisions for the distribution of this stockpile material after the emergency has passed, but, as I read the amendment, it would prevent stockpiling under emergency conditions if the stockpiling itself would constitute a threat to American agriculture.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McKINNON. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. The gentleman is entirely in error. It would not prevent stockpiling, it would not prevent greater production when ordered by the Secretary of Agriculture to get more linseed.

Mr. McCARTHY. If you bring it in you have a stockpile.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] to the substitute.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SPENCE) there were—ayes 61, noes 129.

So the amendment to the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SPENCE) there were—ayes 65, noes 136.

So the substitute was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN].

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin: On page 2, after line 21, insert a new subsection as follows:

"(c) Add a new section of title 1 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 to read as follows:

"SEC. 104. The President shall establish a single central agency to serve as a claimant to present the construction and supply needs of State and local governments and their tax-supported agencies."

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, in view of the action just taken by the Committee of the Whole, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be corrected to show that it will follow the amendment just adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, in contrast to the rather complicated matter upon which this House has just been deliberating, the purpose of this amendment is quite simple and quite direct. It is to establish one claimant agency for the various governmental units. During World War II there was such an agency. It was called the Government Requirements Bureau. It operated within the War Production Board.

I suppose it might be said with considerable force that this is an administrative matter and that, therefore, it should be handled by the administrative agencies without action on the part of the Congress. As a matter of fact, however, the assurance has been given several times that such a unified agency would be created, but the months have gone by and that assurance has never been acted upon.

Just about a month ago an order was issued which continues the existing claimant agencies, so that at the present time the local and State governments in order to have their needs presented must act through not one but through at least 19 different claimant agencies. This means that our States, our county and city governments, and our school districts in the States must try to verse themselves in the operations of those 19 agencies, instead of being able to operate through one.

I think it would alleviate a confusing situation for the 168,000 local and State governmental units in this Nation if they were permitted to operate at this time as they were during World War II, through some sort of a single claimant agency.

As I said, perhaps there will be some feeling that it is not necessary to write this into legislation, but this will not be the first time the Congress has found it necessary, because of the dilatory tactics of an administrative agency, to write into law a provision to enact something that has been promised many times by administrators but has never been acted upon. I think it will eliminate confusion and will increase the efficiency of the allocations program if this amendment is adopted.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. What difference would there be between the service of the agency about which the gentleman is speaking as compared to the services now rendered by NPA?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. This would work through and with the NPA.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does not the NPA render this kind of service now?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. It attempts to. It deals with several claimant agencies that present the case for requirements, just as I would like to have one claimant agency that would present the claims of these governmental units for materials. At the present time, when a school wants materials, it may have to work through the Federal Security Administration, or it may have to work through one or more of the 18 other agencies. There are 19 of them operating with, and dealing with, the local units of government at the present time.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KEATING. Under the gentleman's amendment, the way it would operate would be that if a school district or any other unit would go to this one central agency, it in turn would know which group among these various war agencies the matter should be taken up with, and would go directly to it?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is the purpose, to channelize the necessary requests for materials.

Mr. KEATING. It strikes me it would be a very desirable thing. We have all encountered difficulty under the present system.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I can confirm what the gentleman from New York has just said, because we had such a situation with regard to governmental agencies in Milwaukee.

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I am sure you have had.

Mr. KERSTEN of Wisconsin. I appreciate the gentleman's point. I think we would be doing a good and real service through the adoption of this amendment.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. ZABLOCKI. I also want to commend my colleague for offering this

amendment, and I want to join in sponsoring it. In many instances my office was called to aid the city of Milwaukee in trying to get through the various departments an application with the NPA. Is it not true that if the gentleman's amendment is adopted this agency will provide information and aid to the State and other local governments and help get allocations and priorities, to aid the efforts these local governments are making together and mutually with our other defense and military efforts in the American production job?

Mr. DAVIS of Wisconsin. That is the purpose of the amendment, and I believe it will be of real benefit to State and local governmental units.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WOLCOTT: On page 2, line 16, after the word "conditions," strike out the words "and exceptions."

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, it will be noted by reference to section 102 that the President, to prevent hoarding, and for other purposes, may designate certain materials as materials which cannot be hoarded. In order that there might be a better understanding of the matter before us, let me read the forefront of section 102, which does not appear in the copy:

In order to prevent hoarding, no person shall accumulate (1) in excess of the reasonable demands of business, personal, or home consumption, or (2) for the purpose of resale at prices in excess of prevailing market prices, materials which have been designated by the President as scarce materials or materials the supply of which would be threatened by such accumulation. The President shall order published in the Federal Register, and in such other manner as he may deem appropriate, every designation of materials the accumulation of which is unlawful and any withdrawal of such designation.

The amendment proposed is this: "Making such designation the President may prescribe such conditions and exceptions with respect to the accumulation of materials in excess of the reasonable demand," and so forth.

With the language "and exceptions" included it makes possible gross discrimination between corporations, agencies, and individuals. Of course I do not suppose we could presume that in the administration of any law there would be any discrimination in the allocation of materials, but we do have complaints today from small business as well as big business and from individuals that favoritism is being shown in the distribution and allocation of materials.

If the President is authorized to make exceptions in respect to stockpiling and in respect to the amount of material which might be accumulated by any person, then the charge can be made perhaps successfully that exceptions are made in some cases. Now, I do not want anyone to say that merely because I am a Republican favoritism is being shown

to me by the administration over a good, loyal, constitutional Democrat. I do not want anybody to say that because I am a Republican I can have 100 pounds of beef in my deep freeze, but that because another person is a Democrat he can have only 50 pounds. That is what this language says. But, more serious is this situation:

As between two manufacturing concerns, as between, let us say, the Ford Motor Co. and General Motors, under this language an entirely different rule can be set up for the amount of material which the Ford Co. might have to the disadvantage of General Motors. I merely use these two concerns as an example.

In the stockpiling or accumulation of raw materials sometimes lies the answer as to whether a concern can satisfactorily compete with another concern. I do not think we should put any agency of the Government in a position where it can successfully be charged that under the law they can show favoritism to one concern over another concern.

That is the gist of the whole situation. The President may prescribe such conditions as he may see fit for the distribution of goods; but with the amendment which I have offered, favoritism cannot be shown. There can be no exceptions to the general rule. Everybody will have to be treated alike in the allocation of material.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOLCOTT. I yield.

Mr. SIMPSON of Pennsylvania. I understand that reasonableness of the amount he got would then be the test.

Mr. WOLCOTT. It might be the test. It also might depend upon the interpretation of the reasonableness of it whether or not a concern is put out of business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, and I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, this is another of those very simple amendments that does nothing except impede the proper administration of the law. In other words, the gentleman offering the amendment says to you that the President may not impose any exceptions or grant any exemptions, as far as the accumulation of material is concerned. He says that it is all right to impose conditions under the anti-hoarding amendment. You have there a provision against the unreasonable accumulation of material, whether it is for home consumption or for national defense or otherwise. In other words, under the proposed amendment if a businessman says, "I am willing to invest my money and buy up outside of this country and import and stockpile for the Government cobalt or aluminum or any other strategic material," the President cannot say, "You can do that." The only

way you can get that material, if you do not grant an exception, is to compel the Government to go out and buy and stockpile that material. The same instance can be multiplied thousands of times. They go right through the entire economy. You will not be able to do those things under this proposal. As a matter of fact, you will even destroy the amendment you have just passed, embargoing the importation of fats and oils and other items in order to build up your production here in order to build up stockpiles. If the President cannot give you an exception so that you can stockpile linseed oil or any of the other items as you increase production—and if you increase production only as far as you can consume it, it will do no good—you vitiate all of the provisions in the law which tend to effectuate the allocation and priorities title of this bill.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. SPENCE. Was not the word "exception" placed in there in order that he might have authority to help the small dealer?

Mr. MULTER. That was one of the things we had in mind. You cannot possibly treat a small-business man the same as a big fellow. The big fellow buys an inventory of a million dollars. The small fellow will buy only a thousand dollars worth, but his \$1,000 inventory may be 100 percent more than he had last year, while the million-dollar inventory may be a drop in the bucket to the big fellow.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. HALLECK. I think the use of the word "conditions" would take care of that situation, because conditions could be made general; and if the purpose were to have general classification, then those conditions could be accepted.

Mr. MULTER. If "exceptions" are included in "conditions," why take the word "exceptions" out of the law? Why did we put it in there in the first place if we did not intend it to cover two different provisions?

Mr. HALLECK. If the gentleman will yield further, I have always proceeded on the theory that when additional words are used they mean something. I do not believe that "conditions" is synonymous with "exceptions."

Mr. MULTER. I agree. And that answers the argument you made a moment ago. We need the word "exceptions" as well as "conditions." The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] is offering an amendment to take out the word "exceptions."

Mr. HALLECK. The point you made a moment ago seemed to indicate that if the word "exceptions" were taken out, the small business might thereby be prejudiced.

Mr. MULTER. Yes.

Mr. HALLECK. I do not hold with that at all because I think that under the application of the word "conditions," small business as a class could be taken care of under the conditions imposed.

Mr. MULTER. I cannot understand how you can write a condition as a part of a regulation so as to grant a specific exemption.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. KEATING. If the antihoarding provisions are sound in order to prevent inflationary trends, and I believe they are, then does not the granting of exceptions completely vitiate the basic provision against hoarding?

Mr. MULTER. Of course it does not.

Mr. KEATING. Why not? If anybody can grant blanket exceptions here, there, and yonder?

Mr. MULTER. The answer to that is very simple: If you do not trust the President, do not pass this law. This law vests all of these authorities in the President.

Mr. KEATING. The gentleman has answered my question.

Mr. MULTER. If you are not going to trust him as to one of these powers, you certainly cannot trust him as to any. I can point out one department of our Government that is operating satisfactorily to the Republicans. The distinguished chairman of our committee joined me in asking questions a few moments ago about the embargo amendment and you found unanimity of opinion among the Republicans that at least as to that provision of law the Department of Agriculture is operating satisfactorily under your President. Every other department is operating under our President. I am satisfied that all departments are operating satisfactorily under the same President.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott].

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the Committee divided and there were—ayes 80, noes 86.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chair appointed as tellers Mr. WOLCOTT and Mr. PATMAN.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 126, noes 111.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, if my memory serves me correctly, it was about a year ago that the President sent up to the Congress a request for what was known as a Defense Production Authority that had to do primarily with priorities, allocations, requisitions, expansion of production, and consumer-real estate credits. It will be recalled that this was shortly after the President had committed our forces to Korea. After that message came to the Congress it became apparent throughout the country that the impact on our economy would be

such as to, in all likelihood, bring about an increase in prices in many fields and further fire the fuels of inflation which have beset us for many years. Because of that fact there arose across the country an insistent demand that the Congress do something affirmatively and effectively to deal with the problem of price and wage stabilization. It is significant that no request came from the White House for any such action. The request as it came to the Congress on that occasion came from the people, and as the result of that request, which I say was overwhelming, the Congress responded, and in September of last year enacted the Defense Production Authority Act, which included added titles dealing with price and wage stabilization.

There was considerable controversy about this at the time. However, I think the larger part of the argument revolved around the original request from the White House than around the provision of wage and price stabilization.

Today the administration, which a year ago not only did not ask for anything to deal with price and wage stabilization but as a matter of fact opposed it, is here putting the chief emphasis on added authority to deal with price and wage stabilization. Now we are hearing again the talk of pressure groups, pressure groups supposedly sinister, or alleged to be sinister, that somehow or other are working their will upon the Congress. Well, let me say that I have listened to that sort of talk from people in the Government so long that I am getting pretty tired of it.

I resent the implication that the Congress of the United States, sent here by the people to represent them, is subservient to the will of so-called pressure groups. I served on the Lobby Investigating Committee in the last Congress and I observed there the tremendous effort that was made by some to try to make it appear that all private interests or private lobbying organizations, whatever they may be, are sinister and bad. Yet if the lobbying comes from the departments downtown, we are told it is all good. There again, no one was able to make anything like that stick. Of course, it is only important now as we hear again the drums of the people in the Government downtown beating, prodding, going out over the airways and into the press, trying to make it appear that there is some sort of a sell-out going on here in the Congress. Again, I say, I resent that. And we have come to a point where we hear the suggestion that the cease-fire operations now going on in Korea are nothing but some sort of a Communist threat to wreck the control program in this country. That will certainly be sad news to a lot of the boys in Korea and to a lot of people in this country who have been led to believe that those cease-fire talks might really produce something that would bring about peace. I would still like to believe it in spite of all the suggestions that have been made.

Today, of course, there is talk about the impact of the situation that is going on in the country in respect to prices; people worrying about inflation. Well,

I might suggest that some people should have been worried about that a long time ago. An eminent economist reported the other day that inflation, since the days of the depression, has cost the person with his money invested in dollars 61 times as much as was lost by all of the people in the bank failures during the depression.

Of course, we are all worried about inflation and high prices. The question is, What are we going to do about it? Every housewife in Indiana knows when a pot boils over on the stove, the only sensible thing to do is to turn down the fire under the pot. She knows that trying to hold down the lid will not do any good, certainly for not very long.

In fact, she knows she would get badly scalded if she tried to do that.

By the same token, we cannot hope to reduce the pressure on our economic system by holding the lid down on prices and wages by direct controls alone. We have to get at the fire which is generating the inflation steam.

Much of this heat results from the administration's spending policy. There is no evidence that the administration, for all its protestations about concern for the consumer and the taxpayer, is doing a thing to cut back on Federal spending. In fact, the Congress has been meeting with administration resistance at every turn in its efforts to reduce appropriations.

Moreover, the administration has consistently stifled, rather than promoted, the consumer production so vitally needed, and it has failed to exercise basic credit and monetary controls.

Of course, none of us should delude ourselves that the passage of this bill or any other bill would satisfy an administration which has already demonstrated its total inability or unwillingness, probably a combination of both, to effectively and sincerely tackle the basic problems of inflation.

Regardless of what we do or what we do not do, the administration, the folks downtown, are already primed to blame the Congress for whatever further mess that same administration makes of the situation in which the Nation now finds itself.

Yes, the White House is all set to blame the Congress, and this time you know it will be a Democrat-controlled Congress, for conditions which can be laid directly on the doorstep of incompetent administrative leadership.

Let me emphasize again what has already been pointed out.

The Congress did pass legislation last September which, had there been any intelligent foresight on the part of the administration, might well have proved an effective brake on inflation. As a matter of fact, some of us fought for what undoubtedly would have been a much more effective and equitable bill, that was known as the Kunkel substitute.

But we did give the White House and the administration the tools with which to do a job.

What happened?

The White House and the Truman administration insisted loudly that it did not need and did not want control over

wages and prices. That was in September of 1950. I have tried to figure out why they felt that way about it, and maybe it goes back to that campaign oratory of the then candidate for Vice President, Mr. BARKLEY, who went to Springfield, Ill., on August 18, 1948, and said:

It is legitimate for me to ask today whether you want to change back from \$40 cattle and \$30 hogs.

In other words, if you want \$40 cattle and \$30 hogs, vote the Democratic ticket.

The candidate for President had something to say about that:

I want to say to you that if the farmers of this country know which side their bread is buttered on—and I believe they do—they're not going to put this Republican gang in control of the Government.

It is obvious that apparently a lot of farmers must have believed that.

The President also said:

Never in the world were the farmers of any republic or any kingdom or any other country as prosperous as the farmers of the United States.

Then cattle were about \$40. Of course, you orators in the city were saying to the city folks, "These awful folks are responsible for dollar beefsteak in the city." But whether you know it or not, if you come from the city, there is a lot more to the steer than beefsteak. If he is \$40 a hundred, you do not carve out steaks at less than a dollar a pound, if you make it at that. As a matter of fact, today cattle are about \$32 in Chicago and hogs are \$23.

The contract that you folks were making in that campaign was a 4-year contract. I sometimes wonder what you are concerned about. You ought to take the responsibility for high beef prices, if the people in the cities do not like it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HALLECK. When you talk about the price of beefsteak, everyone wants to see it lower, of course. But let us take another look at the record. The administration did not want controls last September or during the months that followed.

But they want even more controls now—more controls and what they choose to call roll-backs.

Having missed the bus in September, they would like to roll back the calendar—and I refer to the administration people—piling confusion on top of confusion because they failed to act at the proper time.

Instead of acting, the administration vacillated, stalled, yes, and looked the other way, for months after adequate executive powers were on the books. Cattle were \$27 last fall, and again I say they are \$32 now.

Not until the fat was in the fire did the administration attempt action. Not until the simmering pot was coming to

a rolling boil did the administration attempt action. And even then such action was a half-hearted attempt to apply controls under a formula that put politics before national welfare.

Every move was made with an eye to political consequences.

And now, having first failed to use the powers granted to the Executive, and then having abused those powers, the administration wails that more absolute and far-reaching authority is necessary.

I say that regardless of what powers we might see fit to grant we would still face a whining protest that the Congress had not gone far enough.

Our problem today is not only how best to control inflation. It is also how to get the job done, after the Congress agrees once more on measures, by an administration of proven incompetence.

We might just as well realize, to put it bluntly, that the Congress, no matter how hard it might try, cannot legislate competence into the Truman administration.

The people of this country have—and we might as well face this basic fact—the people of this country have lost faith in the ability of this administration to cope with the problems we find before us.

The people realize—and not without abundant evidence—that in the final analysis the Congress can only create tools in the form of laws. And no law, no matter how expertly conceived, is of any value unless it is wisely administered.

That, really, is our problem: How to achieve sincere, effective administration of the laws passed by the Congress.

We have not been getting effective, sincere administration and we are not going to get it.

The people have lost faith in the administration and so has the Congress.

There is no good reason why this great Nation cannot do the job that needs to be done without putting everybody into an unnecessary strait-jacket of regimentation and control.

The trouble lies in the fact that this administration insists on tying to the emergency its carefully laid plans for an ever-increasing Government stranglehold on our national economic system.

It insists on exploiting an emergency atmosphere to its own ends.

Those ends are bigger spending proposals, bigger bureaucracy, more jobs for party faithful, higher taxes, and more controls.

What we really need is an honest desire by the administration to get this job done with a minimum of dislocation to all segments of our people.

I am convinced that an intelligent assessment of the program we must undertake, an assessment made with the reasonable security of America in mind, along with a realistic appraisal of our own capabilities, will disclose that we can do the job that needs to be done from here on out. And it will disclose, further, that it can be done without all this hamstringing of industry, business, labor, and agriculture that is proposed.

The administration asks for more authority when it has not shown an ability to intelligently use what has already been extended.

What the administration really needs is a genuine will to make the American system work as it was designed to work—as a system of free men who produce best when they are not saddled with restrictions, regimentation, and control.

There is, I repeat, no bill that this Congress could pass which could create in this administration that sort of will.

The best we can do under the circumstances is to resist the efforts of the White House to impose an ever-increasing load of debt and an unnecessary tightening net of controls around our people.

In its failure to cope with the problems of the hour the administration will once again attempt to pin the blame for its own shortcomings on the Congress.

This it will attempt to do regardless of the action we take here.

I am confident, however, that the people of this country have been fooled for the last time by Mr. Truman and his Socialist-minded coterie. I believe the people still have faith in the deliberations of the Congress.

We should not let them down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I always make a special effort to be present to listen to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK]. During the years that he has served with me in the House I have found him very interesting. In fact, I can truthfully say that I find him very amusing. His ability to talk all around a piece of legislation without disclosing his point of view has afforded me many a laugh.

The gentleman from Indiana is like the late James J. Corbett, former heavyweight champion boxer of the world. Corbett, after he retired, was famous for his inability to pick a winner. The gentleman from Indiana is a worthy successor to Corbett's laurels. His inability to feel the pulse of the people and to recognize their wants is common to the party for which he is such an able mouthpiece. The failure of his party to recognize the intelligence of the citizenry of this country has kept that party out of political power in the Federal Government for almost a quarter of a century. Old-time vaudevillians would change their act every 6 months or a year, but the Republican Party cannot see innovations of that type. They are still trying to sell the old act with the same songs and chatter that they used a quarter of a century ago. Truthfully, they have become the Cherry sisters of politics.

I do not believe that politics should enter into the question of controls, but unfortunately the gentleman from Indiana chose to put this question on the political stage. Over a year and a half ago, the gentleman from Indiana while speaking on the floor of this House used nearly the identical words and phrases that he uttered today. He told how the people had lost faith in the administration, that they did not want controls, that they wanted the free-enterprise system. I do not like to recall to the gentleman the result that was obtained in the election the following November.

I recognize the gentleman for his courage. He always has the courage to fight for the minorities. In his case the minorities are people with the views of the National Association of Manufacturers, the National Real Estate Board, the National Chamber of Commerce, and the Goulds and Rockefellers.

My distinguished colleague said that he resents the talk emanating from the administration that pressure is being used to defeat this measure. Surely, the gentleman must realize that we in this House are not so naive that we do not believe that some of the most powerful financial groups in this country are doing everything in their power to remove controls and to prohibit the strengthening of the existing regulations. Does he choose to completely ignore the great wave of pressure that is coming in favoring this legislation? Does he choose to ignore the pressure whose source is from the grass roots and the asphalt of our Nation? Because the people of the United States are speaking lucidly and forcefully on an issue that affects their every-day existence does he think that their plea and call should be ignored? The gentlemen should not look down on these people because they have not the media of the press, radio, and other facilities of public opinion at their command. He should not brush their thoughts aside because they are unable to write speeches for Congressmen to deliver upon this floor. He must realize that this is the voice of the people of our country who make the Government and who are the Government and who have a right to dictate the policies under which they desire to live. These are the people who are paying the bill. These are the people who—when they gather at the cross road, the street corner, the butcher shop, the grocery store—maintain that prices are entirely too high, that profits are too great, and that their dollar purchases too little. These are the people who have sent us here believing that it is a representative form of government and that we should speak for them and recognize their plight.

If the Republican Party desires inflation, excessive profits, and a higher cost of living the people will recognize the party's aims. If the Republican Party desires to see higher prices that have led to economic ruin in almost every European country they will continue to vote and speak as they have during the debate on this measure. If the gentleman from Indiana desires to once again make this the political issue of a campaign, we will gladly pick up the gauntlet and go to the people in the American way at election time, and I know that once again the people will recognize the inertia, disinterest, and lack of responsibility shown by that party, and will once again hand the reins of Government to the Democratic Party that is not afraid to fight the people's battle.

Let the gentleman from Indiana continue to give this type of leadership, and I can safely vouch for a Democratic administration for many years to come.

The other side of the aisle labels this legislation socialism and regimentation. During the 15 years that I have been in this House each measure that was

brought up on the floor for debate that benefited the mass of our people was sure to have the cry of socialism and regimentation thrown at it from the Republican side of this body. Fair wages and hours, social security, the strengthening of the workingman's compensation laws, and similar legislation was damned with the opprobrium of socialism.

If this measure before the House today, which is an attempt on the part of the Government to control gross profits and the high cost of living and make it possible for the workingman to feed his family, is termed socialism, I, for one, am not afraid to embrace it.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOPE: On page 2, after line 21, insert a new paragraph as follows:

"Section 101 of the Defense Production Act of 1950 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following: 'No restriction, quota, or other limitation shall be placed upon the quantity of livestock which may be slaughtered or handled by any processor.'"

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is the same that was adopted by the Senate when it had the price-control bill under consideration recently. I am offering it believing that if it is adopted the people of this country will get more meat, which is what they want at the present time.

We heard some remarks on this floor yesterday that I think were more or less facetious, about people being compelled to eat horse meat. They are not going to be compelled to eat horse meat in this country if Mr. DiSalle will let them purchase and consume the beef, pork, lamb, and veal that is available. As a matter of fact, if Mr. DiSalle will not interfere too much we will have this year a supply of meat which will be greater per capita than we have ever had, with one or two exceptions. We will have about the same supply of beef that we had last year. We will have about the same supply of veal. We will have about 3½ pounds per capita more pork available. We will have about the same amount of lamb. Under the authority which the Director of Price Stabilization has asserted, by virtue of the provision in the law which gives the President power to make allocations of scarce materials, he has set up a system whereby every slaughterer must procure a slaughter quota before he can kill cattle or hogs. There are no price ceilings on hogs, nevertheless a slaughter quota has been put into effect as to hogs. Notwithstanding the fact that there are more cattle in this country this year than last the slaughter quota on cattle for the month of June was 80 percent of the number killed for the similar period a year ago. In July it has been raised to 90 percent.

In the case of hogs the June quota was 115 percent of a year ago. It has been reduced now to 105 percent of a year ago. That, of course, prevents the legitimate slaughterers of this country from slaughtering as much beef as they slaughtered a year ago, yet we have more beef on the hoof than we had a year ago. Slaughterers this month must slaughter

10 percent fewer hogs than they slaughtered last month because Mr. DiSalle says that that is the quota which will be permitted for this particular period.

We are told that these quotas were imposed to prevent black markets, but my question is: If that be the case and the legitimate slaughterers are permitted to purchase only a portion of the amount they purchased a year ago when there are more cattle and hogs now than then where is the extra supply going to go? I think the question is too obvious to need an answer, for if it goes to market, for there is only one place that it can go—the black market.

Farmers are opposed to these slaughtering quotas for several reasons. One is that they feel that it gives the packer a club over their head they would not have otherwise, because when there are more cattle or hogs on the market or more hogs on the market than the market can absorb or the packers can buy, all the packer has to do is to say: "I cannot buy any more today; I have bought my quota." Then he can go on and say: "I can buy on next week's quota, and I will take what you have left, but at a lower price," and they use that as a means of beating down the price. I do not say that every packer does it, but it is being done; and the result is that the farmer is forced to take a lower price than he would have to take in an unrestricted market.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Not long ago we had luncheon with the meat producers of my State. Their complaint was that while they have no objection to your fixing a price on what they can sell, they do object that there is no ceiling price on the producer of the beef; he can charge anything he wants. That day they said to us: "We are losing \$2 a head on the slaughter of hogs, and we are going to lose on beef." I think the price of beef is clear out of line at the present time, and I wish something could be done about it; but that is their complaint. Now, what are we going to do to correct that?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOPE. I will tell you what Mr. DiSalle did; he did something very effective; he rolled back the price of the producer. That took about \$700,000,000 from the cattle producer and gave it to the packers and distributors. That is what Mr. DiSalle has done. So the difficulty the gentleman mentions may have been corrected to the satisfaction of his packers, although I may say that I do not know any meat producer, packer, or distributor who is satisfied with the program which Mr. DiSalle has inaugurated.

Mr. DONDERO. That was 3 weeks ago.

Mr. HOPE. Prices have been rolled back, and the packers have gotten the benefit of it.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman has just discussed the effect of this quota system and has pointed out that when a producer brings his cattle into the market and the packers all say, "I have no quota," he is left without an adequate market. Is not that surplus which is left there in the market without a place to go the place from which the black market always gets its start? In other words, does not some black marketeer come along and buy those cattle that the packers cannot legitimately buy, take them out and slaughter them?

Mr. HOPE. That is the thing that is most likely to happen and it is what will happen if the legitimate slaughterers cannot buy them. The farmer will have to take his product home, or it will be purchased by someone without a quota.

I am opposed to this slaughter quota provision also for the additional reason that it discriminates against the little packers and those who have no history of having killed a uniform number of livestock per month. I recently talked to a man out in my town who runs a large food business, who slaughters part of his own beef. I asked him how this was affecting him. He said: "I cannot get a quota. I have always killed some beef. I have always bought some beef from the packers. I have done whatever I could do which was the best for my customers. If I could do better by buying from the packers I bought from the packers; if I could do better by buying at home and slaughtering, I would do that. But because a year ago I was not buying from the packers, I cannot get a slaughter quota. Based on 2 years ago I could. The result is I have to buy from the packers."

You see what that does to competition. It gives the big packers an unlimited market here without any competition from the little slaughterers in your community and mine. Its tendency will be to make big packers bigger and put small packers out of business.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. I find an inconsistency in the gentleman's explanation to our colleague from Texas [Mr. POAGE]. The little packers cannot get an allocation for slaughtering but will get this cattle that is fed into the black market. Is it better to have a restriction on all slaughtering if we want to avoid a black market?

Mr. HOPE. The people who do not have slaughter permits will be driven to the black market or out of business altogether.

Mr. JAVITS. The gentleman feels we would be better off if we kept that slaughterer out of the market or in the market?

Mr. HOPE. Let us have them all in without any restrictions, just as we had before the controls went into effect.

Then everybody will have an equal opportunity. The producer can sell his product, the packer can slaughter it, large or small, it will go on the market and we will get the full benefit of our large production of meat animals.

Mr. JAVITS. What the gentleman is saying in practical effect is you want no controls of any kind, either price or otherwise, and if you have no control over the slaughterers you would make price control easier?

Mr. HOPE. I do not think you would. The only outlet you have if the legitimate slaughterers cannot kill the beef is for it to go to the black markets. It is an encouragement to black marketing. There is no other conclusion that can be reached.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Is not the nub of the gentleman's argument this: There are not enough slaughterers' permits being given? From the gentleman's argument, as I get it, apparently the Price Stabilizer is not allocating sufficient slaughtering permits to the small packer, is that true? And if that is true, why cannot sufficient permits be given to those people to prevent the cattle from going into the black market?

Mr. HOPE. I think they can. It would be of some assistance if the Price Stabilizer would issue a larger number of permits, and increase the percentage of livestock to something near the amount that is likely to come to market. But it all goes back to the fact that the Economic Stabilizer or Mr. DiSalle has to guess how many cattle are going to come to market and he fixes that as the quota. His guess may be good or it may be bad.

Mr. YATES. Will not those people who are in business and qualify as packers be able to get licenses to continue to slaughter?

Mr. HOPE. Some of them can and some cannot. But, suppose they do get them, if they can only kill 90 percent of what they did a year ago, although there are more cattle in the country now than then.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I think perhaps I can help explain the situation that the gentleman from Kansas is attempting to call to the attention of the House by telling the House of an incident in my own district, in the city of Bellefontaine, Logan County, Ohio, which is a city of about 12,000; the county seat of a rural county, in which there was a little slaughtering plant that had been in operation a number

of years, but the conditions in that slaughtering plant were not up to modern standards, sanitation and all. So, the farm leaders of that county and community and some of the civic leaders got together and purchased the plant last year and spent about 7 months in modernizing the plant. When they were ready to open they were told by the officials in the regional office in Cleveland, Ohio, to go ahead with their normal slaughtering and a permit would be issued later. However, when the permit came along the number of animals they were permitted to slaughter was based not on the entire year of 1950, but on what had been slaughtered in the old plant in a little over 3 months, so that they could not operate at a profit. After weeks of discussion with everybody—this man Leach that you have in OPS, Mike DiSalle and others—a ruling was finally made despite the orders of the regional office, that they had to be bound by the 3 months' limit, and then cut by 80 percent, and the result is that that little packing plant has been closed and the local meat markets are unable to get their meat supply locally, and they have to depend on these outside packers. Now that is the situation up there, and that is an outrage.

Mr. HOPE. Well, there are many similar instances, and there are many cases where a small packer, who is running on a pretty close margin anyway, cannot operate under an 80- or 90-percent allocation. He makes his profit out of the last 10 or 20 percent of his slaughter.

Mr. ALBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. ALBERT. It is not only the slaughtering quotas, but the grading regulations in the small communities, along with other things, that are making it almost impossible for the small butcher-slaughtering to operate.

Mr. HOPE. That is true. There is hardly a regulation issued by Mr. DiSalle that does not have the direct or indirect effect of reducing the meat supply of this country.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. It is not only the lack of license and the regulations, but the cost of the graders themselves in the small plants, particularly in the rural districts, where they have to travel miles and be paid for it that makes it impossible for the small plants to operate.

Mr. HOPE. Yes, and that contributes to the closing of many small plants. There is no question about that.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. GAMBLE. The packers in addition to having a quota for the month, must buy at an average price for that month which is not over the ceiling price. Is it not a fact that the packers are afraid to buy at the prevailing price at the beginning of the month which might be over the ceiling without know-

ing whether they can buy at a lower price later on in the month and maintain their average price not over the ceiling?

Mr. HOPE. That is true.

Mr. GAMBLE. And he would be penalized if his average price is over the ceiling.

Mr. HOPE. That has the effect of reducing the price to the producer because of the caution which the slaughterer must exercise in making his purchases during the early part of the month.

Mr. BRAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. BRAY. There is a situation even worse than any that has been mentioned so far. In Bloomington, Ind., there is a packer, the Bloomington Frosted Food Locker Co., Inc., that provided the university dining rooms there with a certain type of meat to meet their needs. Prior to 1948 they had built as fine a packing plant as there is in the country for its size. In 1948 they entered into an agreement with some other packers whereby they were to do the buying from them and do the processing of the meat themselves. That worked out very well until this present emergency came about, and they have been unable to buy the beef that they must have. They are not in the black market; they are absolutely reliable, and the meat section of OPS here agreed to that, but they said, "We absolutely cannot allow anyone to start butchering that has not done so in 1950." I said, "Do you mean to say the situation is now that no one can start another packing plant in America?" They said, "That is exactly what we mean." Unless this amendment goes through, that is exactly the situation we are going to have. That is absolutely un-American.

Mr. HOPE. That means that everyone has to get a license because that is what a quota amounts to. Mr. DiSalle suggested awhile ago that he wanted to license all business and you know what a storm that caused. He has already licensed the packing business.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has again expired.

Mr. COOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman be permitted to proceed for three additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

Mr. COOLEY. The statement has been made to the effect that if quotas on slaughtering are prevented black markets will be encouraged and will flourish. Has anyone in Mr. DiSalle's office given our committee any satisfactory proof of the fact that this quota provision is calculated to control black markets?

Mr. HOPE. We have asked the question, of course, in the committee and at other times of Mr. DiSalle and other people from his organization. They always beat around the bush and do not come up with any direct answer. That has been the experience we have had. They have, I think, to a certain extent let the cat out of the bag when they say that it is a lot easier to convict a man

of violating a slaughtering quota than it is to convict him of selling meat above ceiling prices. In other words they want it as a punitive measure.

Mr. COOLEY. But they lose complete sight of the fact that black-market meat does not necessarily have to go to the slaughter house at all. It can be slaughtered in the woods, on the creeks, behind trees, and in barns.

Mr. HOPE. That is correct. For that reason, I do not think the reason they give gets to the real black-market situation.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Is it possible, in the gentleman's opinion, to have a price-control system on livestock without having such a quota and slaughtering regulation?

Mr. HOPE. I will have to answer the gentleman this way: I do not believe you can successfully maintain price controls on beef under any circumstances. I do not think it can be done. I think that any attempt to do so will in the end result in failure. It will result in less meat, it will result in black markets, it will result in law violations of all kinds. I believe that will be the experience we will have under this program, no matter what we do here or do not do here, just as it was the experience we had under the program during World War II.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOPE. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Is not what the gentleman from North Carolina said getting down to this, that if the slaughterer is not licensed then if he sells on the black market he is guilty of only one crime, he has sold on the black market and broken the price ceiling, but on the other hand, if he has to be licensed he is guilty of two violations, he is doing it without a license and he is also selling over the ceiling price. Therefore, are not we in the cities better off to have him licensed?

Mr. COOLEY. I do not have any objection to the licensing aspects of it, it is the limitation of the quota. Certainly you can license a slaughterer. I assume that most reputable slaughterers are licensed. The gentleman knows pretty well that the big packers are not going to violate this law, the violations are going to be by the fly-by-night black-market racketeers.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, there has been much confusion about slaughtering quotas. The facts are very simple. The expected supply of meat for any month is distributed among the regular slaughterers in proportion to the amount they slaughtered in 1950. It is, in fact, following precisely the provisions of section 701 (c) of the act which calls for making materials available to businesses in the normal channel of distribution on the basis of their historical consumption.

The computation starts with a known factor, the number of meat animals of various kinds which were slaughtered each month in 1950. Each month OPS, in cooperation with the Department of

Agriculture and the industry, makes an estimate of the number of cattle, hogs and other kinds of animals which the farmers will send to the market for slaughter each month. If OPS estimates that the same number of cattle or hogs will be sent to market as were slaughtered during the same month last year, a quota of 100 percent would be assigned to each slaughterer. If the estimate is that only 50 percent as many will be sent to market as were slaughtered during the same month last year, then quotas of 50 percent would be assigned. By the same token, if the estimate is that twice as many animals will be sent to market during the coming month, then a quota of 200 percent would be assigned.

If more animals are sent to market than expected, the quotas are increased accordingly. In other words, the quota is based solely on the relation between the supply for the month and the number of animals slaughtered during the same month last year.

In May the following quotas were assigned:

	Percent
Cattle	90
Calves	87
Sheep and lambs	87
Hogs	110

For June the quotas assigned were:

	Percent
Cattle	80
Calves	80
Sheep and lambs	80
Hogs	115

For July the quotas are:

	Percent
Cattle	90
Calves	85
Sheep and lambs	85
Hogs	105

By this method, all the cattle sent to market are channeled to the normal distributors through the normal channels of distribution, and consumers are able to buy their normal amount of meat at their usual places of supply.

WILL ESTABLISH CHAOS

Ordinarily I would not be in favor of freezing anything in the normal channels of trade and distribution which might prevent or hinder or retard or act as a deterrent to some person going into that same business, but we are in an emergency now which of course makes us do things which we would not ordinarily do. I do believe it is in the interest of the country and in the interest of the people to channel the meat supply through the normal distributors, the slaughterers and the wholesaler and retailer. Then the people can go to the places that they normally go to purchase their meat and purchase it there. I am afraid the gentleman's amendment would establish chaos in the industry.

Then, instead of the normal channels of trade and distribution handling the meat it would go through the black market. This is to stop the black market. Certainly we should not encourage it, but stop it as much as possible. The black marketeer would slaughter the animals. He would not be under any quotas. The animals would not go through the normal channels of trade because we have experienced that. They

would go out through a different channel of trade and distribution and you would not get your meat at the grocery store where you normally get it, because it will be diverted. It could not go over through those normal slaughterers as before; and it would not go through the same wholesaler and the same distributors, but will be diverted. Therefore, there would be chaos in the meat industry.

I think it is in the interest of the people and in the interest of the national defense effort that we channel this meat supply, which, of course, will be scarce, through the normal channels of trade.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. In doing that, the people in the areas which do not have a meat supply will have an opportunity to get meat just as they are getting it now. It is more or less frozen in that situation. But if you have chaos, with the black marketeers taking over, butchering the animals back of the barn somewhere, thereby causing all of that waste with which you are acquainted, diverting it from normal channels, the areas where they do not produce meat will not receive their fair share for the people.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Suppose the gentleman had a hundred head of steers on feed today and he would have them ready for market in October, and he ran into an 80-percent slaughter quota, the packer refused to buy, or any other legitimate dealer refused to buy, what would the gentleman from Texas do then?

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is talking about an exceptional case.

Mr. GROSS. Oh, no.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes, it is. That can be provided for easily. That is not new. That has come up before. It was handled under the hardship clause, just as the case mentioned by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Brown]. If they do not handle it properly, it is the fault of the Administrator. Let us not be at fault ourselves. Let us give them the power to do it and expect them to do it discreetly. If they do not do it, we cannot help it, but we will give them the power and iron out such cases as that, adjust the hardship cases later on.

Mr. GROSS. What power are you going to give them?

Mr. PATMAN. I am not going to be diverted on any such detail. That is just incidental. There are many things in the country that there is no way to handle. Controls happen to be one of them. Relief is another. There is no satisfactory way to administer relief. We have got to provide the best law we can and give the administrators the power to properly administer it, to make adjustments, to correct inequalities and

hardships, and then they will be obligated to properly enforce it.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. I notice the comment of the gentleman from Texas, in answer to the question put by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. Gross], with reference to the steers. I happen to represent the great State of Idaho where we have not only a lot of cattle but a lot of sheep. Most of the land out there still belongs to the Federal Government. The Federal Government says how many sheep we can graze on that land. This year we have an unusually heavy lamb crop, a larger percentage of the lambs.

Mr. PATMAN. Now I yielded for a question, if you please.

Mr. BUDGE. This lamb crop this year was exceptionally heavy, due to the fact that there were a lot of doubles. It is almost a hundred percent larger lamb crop, much bigger than last year. What does the gentleman from Texas expect us to do with the lambs left over after 80 percent of them have been slaughtered?

Mr. PATMAN. Now we are talking about quotas.

Mr. BUDGE. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. PATMAN. If you raise a lot more sheep and lambs in Idaho you will have to increase the quotas. In other words, if they raised twice as many, the quota will be 200 percent. If they raised three times as many, the quota will be 300 percent. That will be easily adjusted.

Mr. BUDGE. One more question, please.

Mr. PATMAN. Just a question now.

Mr. BUDGE. In the gentleman's opinion, are we not going back to the Wallace theory of plowing under little pigs?

Mr. PATMAN. No, I do not think so. I do not think we are going in that direction at all.

Mr. BURNSIDE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. BURNSIDE. You just pick that up next month; adjust the quota that way.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes. I thought I explained that.

Now, I do not believe the other body would have placed in this bill many of the amendments they did if they had entertained the idea that the same identical amendments would be accepted over here, because that means they are out of conference. You know how that body acts. They just say, "We will send it to conference. We will just vote for it and send it to conference"; but if we adopt the policy of adopting the identical language like this, the other body having adopted this identical language, then it is not in conference, and there is no way to change it. I do not care how harmful it may be, it is cemented in the bill. There is no way to change it. I respectfully suggest that the best thing to do is certainly not to adopt this in the identical language, so as to take

it out of the area of disagreement, but to leave it as it is, defeat the amendment, and then it will be in conference. If it is a good thing, the conferees can agree to it. This amendment will place the handcuffs on the administration. Mr. Charles E. Wilson made a wonderful speech last night. I hope those who did not hear it will read it. It had the ring of sincerity that could only come from an honest, God-fearing American.

DON'T PASS THE BUCK—MAKE IT WORTH A DOLLAR

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Chairman, when a workman in my district in Philadelphia goes into a store and finds that a pair of workshoes that used to cost him \$6.98 a year ago now has on it a price tag of \$8.65, he does not understand what is going on down here. He reads in the papers that inflation is supposed to be over, and that we do not need price controls.

"What would the price of those shoes be without price controls?" he wants to know. And he wants to know: "When are we going to get the kind of price controls that will get prices down where they belong?"

I have just recently had the honor and privilege of being appointed to the Committee on Banking and Currency of the House of Representatives, and have had the privilege of joining in the committee's deliberations on the Defense Production Act which contains the price control law. This enabled me to bring directly before this committee the protests of thousands of my constituents, whom I personally interviewed, against rising prices and demanding strong price controls. But while I am new to this committee, I want to admonish the members of the great need for legislation of this type.

I do not find it hard to think back to a period 5 years ago, on this very House floor, just exactly 5 years ago in June of 1946, when we had before us another bill dealing with price control. That was during my first term in the Congress and there were many speeches on the House floor by Members who had served here for long periods and were regarded as experts on this kind of legislation.

I listened carefully to those experienced Members as they discussed the OPA. It was my own belief then based on my own background and experience among the working people of Philadelphia, that we needed price controls in 1946 and needed them very badly. I so voted. I opposed all of the amendments to cripple OPA and kill effective price control. My side lost. We were outvoted by those who assured us they had the real answer to all of the Nation's problems and that it was a very simple answer: Just get rid of OPA.

There was a big advertisement running in the newspapers in those days. It said: "Would you like some butter or a roast of beef?" It says OPA means low production, low production means black mar-

kets, black markets mean needlessly high prices.

This ad ran in the Washington Post on May 4, 1946. Ads like it ran in newspapers all over the country. They were paid for by the National Association of Manufacturers—which, by the way, never registered under the lobbying act because it claims it does not engage in lobbying activities.

This ad and others like it and the many millions big business spent in 1946 to stampede the Congress and the people had a lot to do with killing price control in 1946. When the people woke up to what had hit them, it was too late. The cost of living had gone up so fast that millions of wage earners were priced right out of the market, and they never did catch up again on their standard of living for years afterward. As soon as they did start to catch up, and could live fairly decently, along came this inflation last June and took the food right out of their mouths.

Well, we finally got price controls on again and stopped the price rush. Hamburger costs 68 or 70 cents a pound now instead of 55; a quart of milk in Philadelphia is up from 19 to 22 cents or so; a suit of clothes that used to cost \$39.25 in Philadelphia a year ago now costs \$45; rents are up, baby food went up and so did just about everything else, but at least we finally stopped them from going any higher. We are groggy from the beating this inflation gave us, but at least we worked our way out of the windmill of punches and we are getting a chance to catch our breath.

And now the National Association of Manufacturers in trying to talk the Congress into doing the same thing it talked the Seventy-ninth Congress into doing 5 years ago last month, right here on this floor—that is, kill price control and let the profiteers loose again.

Mr. Chairman, we just cannot permit it to happen. We learned our lesson the hard way 5 years ago. We saw our people suffer. We saw mothers forced to cut down on the milk they could buy for their children. We saw kids running around in tatters because clothing cost so much. We saw our constituents lose faith in the Congress—and that is a terrible thing to have happen.

This bill on price control which has come out of the Banking and Currency Committee is not a strong enough bill. It says to the American people that beef is just for the rich and that the poor shall not be enabled to buy it. They must eat something else. We have more beef cattle than we ever had in this country before, and the farmer is making this year probably more money in net income than he ever made—farm income this year will probably be greater even than it was in the peak year of 1947—and yet we are told in this bill that there can be no roll-back on beef prices for the consumer. The roll-back that benefited the packers—that was different. This bill does not touch that. But the roll-backs to benefit the consumer, they are out.

Mr. Chairman, I voted to give the consumer, the workman, the housewife, the break on roll-backs. Meat prices are too high. They must be reduced. This

bill must be amended to reduce meat prices to the consumer. The cattle raiser is doing all right and the roll-back will not ruin them at all.

Between the NAM lobby trying to kill price control and the beef lobby trying to kill the roll-backs on meat prices for the consumer, the Congress is getting the business. But it is bad business, Mr. Chairman. It is not right.

We have the chance here on this bill to show our people that we are working for them and voting in their interest and not for the special interests and the big business interests and the Beef Trust. The people of Philadelphia know that the Democratic administration is in their corner and fighting for them on this issue. Philadelphia is going to go Democratic this year and elect a Democratic city administration for the first time in generations because it has learned that the Democrats on an issue which means decent living standards for the people can be counted on to do the right thing.

But we Democrats are not selfish on things like this. The Republicans in the Congress are invited to join with us in putting through a good bill, and thus helping to redeem their party a little in the eyes of the people.

So here is the chance, Mr. Chairman, for all Members of Congress to show that we are not going to pass the buck—we are going to make it worth a dollar—a hundred cents' worth of purchasing power again.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word and rise in support of the amendment.

Mr. Chairman, if you want chaos in the cattle industry the surest way to have it is to have the quota system. I represent the second largest livestock market in America, at Omaha, Nebr. Here is how those quotas would operate in that market:

If in June 100,000 cattle come to the Omaha market and that is the amount Omaha slaughtered last year, this year they can buy only 80 percent of that number. The other 20,000 that have come to our market must go back to the farm or some questionable purchaser has to buy them.

That is the only way on earth the farmer can get rid of those cattle. If you want to guarantee a black market the surest way on earth to do it is to set quotas and to have quotas that are less than the supply.

Here is what happened in the last war under a similar situation: A friend of mine brought cattle to south Omaha on one of the big market days. He had his cattle in the pens and went over to the livestock exchange to get his dinner. There was no meat on the menu; he could not get meat to eat. He went back to the livestock pens after he had his dinner and asked how much they had sold his cattle for. They replied: "We have not been able to sell them on account of the quotas." So here was a fellow with thousands of pounds of beef on the hoof right in the stockyards ready to sell and yet he could not buy a meat course in the livestock restaurant 200 feet away because quotas had prevented the packers from buying the meat.

That was the time when black markets ran wild. We had a report in the committee in 1945 from the Secretary of the New York State Food Merchants' Association, who had collected facts from 4,500-odd dealers. He reported to our committee that 53 percent of the meat coming through the retail New York market of his association were coming from black markets. That is what the situation will be under quotas.

In the last war, Safeway Stores, one of the biggest food merchants in the United States, had to buy eight packing plants in order to get meat. The quotas were making it impossible for the normal suppliers, the normal processors, to get the supply of cattle that they normally processed in their plants. So I say, Mr. Chairman, that if you want to have black markets keep having quotas and I will guarantee that you will have black markets.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let us take the case of the Safeway Stores; they had to purchase this line of packing plants not so much in order to get all the meat they wanted but in order to get a constant flow of some meat. Is that correct or not?

Mr. BUFFETT. That is largely correct; yes.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Because if the quota prevented them from slaughtering the meat that they need to supply their own retail customers, then it prevented their attaining the big objective, that is, not having all the meat they wanted, but to have a constant flow of meat, a narrow stream or wide stream, a constant flow; they had to acquire those packing plants.

Mr. BUFFETT. That is correct.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is what they are up against now. May I ask the gentleman this question? Under the present situation is this 80 percent order established in advance of the beginning of the month in which it applies?

Mr. BUFFETT. As I understand it, it is established in advance.

Mr. CRAWFORD. If that is correct and I bring my livestock either to a small auction market or to a market like Omaha, and before they dispose of my cattle the quota has been filled, what do you expect me to do with those cattle?

Mr. BUFFETT. You are certainly up against it; you have got to sell your cattle in the black market.

Mr. CRAWFORD. I am asking the gentleman a plain question.

Mr. BUFFETT. You would have to find a buyer.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes, a buyer anywhere I can find a buyer.

Mr. BUFFETT. You have no choice.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is right, I have no choice. And does the gentleman think the men who live and work 12, 14, or 18 hours a day on the farms and ranches are going to submit to that kind of program in this country?

Mr. BUFFETT. No, sir.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Of course, they are not. They will sell to black market or

otherwise. We ought to have sense enough to know that, too.

Mr. BUFFETT. When cattle are ready for market, they are like watermelons, you have to market them.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUFFETT. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. If it is true he has to bring these cattle to market, why, then, did we have such a shortage of cattle coming to the market within the last few months?

Mr. BUFFETT. Does the gentleman mean the temporary shortage for several weeks?

Mr. YATES. Correct.

Mr. BUFFETT. I understand the greater part of that shortage was due to the fact that when the roll-backs were announced a lot of people marketed half-finished cattle. They marketed them ahead of the roll-back and quotas, so that after the quotas were put in there were a small number of cattle in the market for some period of time. If the gentleman has a better answer than that, I would like to have it.

Mr. YATES. I have an answer that I have seen in the newspapers; that is, perhaps it was to the best interest of those who raise the cattle not to bring them to market at that particular time in the hope that amendments such as this would be presented and there would be no ceilings on beef or livestock at all.

Mr. BUFFETT. I suggest to the gentleman he might find that an easy way to go broke is to keep cattle in a feeding lot after they are finished and ready for market. If the gentleman does not believe that, try it sometime.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the pending amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I will undertake to answer the question asked a moment ago by the gentleman from Illinois of the gentleman from Nebraska. Here is the answer, and, incidentally, this is one chamber of commerce that is not against controls but for controls. I quote from a letter I received from the Flatbush Chamber of Commerce:

Our local butchers inform us that shortages are caused by the cattle raisers who are holding up shipments to the markets for higher prices. The retailers are incensed at the methods being used by the wholesalers who have created a black market such as we have never seen before. Butchers are compelled to accept tie-in sales. For a certain amount of inferior grades of meat they must take a box of hams, eggs, butter, etc. If they want choice grades they have to pay in cash all the way down the line in addition to outrageously high prices for the meat and short weight, etc. There are many other disgraceful means of cheating by the black marketeers, meaning the wholesalers, too numerous to mention here.

That is the answer.

To you farmers from Idaho and Nebraska, let me say that I am a Representative of the State of New York. The State of New York raises as much cattle and sells as much livestock and livestock products as 10 other States together, four and a half times as much as Idaho, and almost as much as Nebraska, and

the livestock raisers and producers in my State are not crying the way you gentlemen are.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JAVITS. Will the gentleman explain this point that has just been made about licensing? Is there any control over slaughterers unless this quota provision is in effect?

Mr. MULTER. None whatsoever.

Mr. JAVITS. In other words, they are not licensed at all? This is the only way to control them if you want to avoid black marketing?

Mr. MULTER. You cannot control them without quota regulations. To you farmers who want to protect the little fellow, let me tell you this, and you can read it in the regulations if you want to read because I do know you can read, even though you do not interpret correctly what you read:

Any farmer may slaughter up to 6,000 pounds of livestock a year and freely dispose of it any way he pleases.

There is no quota regulation against them, there is no other regulation against them. That has been traditional in the industry and the OPS and Mr. DiSalle have not tried to change it.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. I am sure that the gentleman, while he is probably quite capable of doing so, does not want to give the House the impression that he represents the State of New York? There are a few others of us here from New York who would like to be recognized also.

Mr. MULTER. I am sorry I gave that impression. I am only 1 of 45 Representatives from the State of New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Quite so, and I am sure the gentleman also does not want to give the impression that all the Representatives from the State of New York take exception in a rather—well, let us say, violent way with the farmers of the great West. I do not think that is entirely correct.

Mr. MULTER. No. I am quite sure you and I agree that New York produces more than 15 percent of the taxes and income in this country and has always helped the rest of the country, and will continue to do so.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Certainly, and we will continue to do so.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. MULTER. Surely.

Mr. TALLE. Perhaps I misunderstood the gentleman, but I gathered from what he said in the early part of his speech that the State of New York produced more livestock than any other 12 States of the Union. Reference was made to Idaho and Nebraska specifically. Now, coming as I do from the State of Iowa, and knowing something about what we produce, I am interested in having the gentleman check his figures so that the Members of the House may have accurate information.

Mr. MULTER. The State of New York is the twelfth highest State of the Union in producing livestock and livestock products.

Mr. TALLE. That is quite a different thing from saying that the State of New York produces as much as any other 12 States put together.

Mr. MULTER. For your edification let me say this. Did the gentleman refer to Iowa?

Mr. TALLE. Yes.

Mr. MULTER. Iowa produces three times as much as the State of New York.

Mr. TALLE. That is fine.

Mr. MULTER. And the State of New York produces four and a half times as much as the State of Idaho.

Mr. TALLE. Now we are getting nearer to the truth. Let us have something about Texas and Florida.

Mr. MULTER. All right, let us take the State of Florida. We will find it here. Florida produces less than one-fifth of that produced by New York State.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. MULTER. I cannot let this moment go by without saying that we heard a lot of pleas earlier in the debate that we ought to approach this Defense Production Act on a nonpartisan basis; that it is not a political issue; that it is a matter of the national interest and the national security. Well, to emphasize that, you were privileged a while ago to hear the distinguished gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK] deliver his campaign speech of 1952. We boys on our side are ready to slug it out with you now if you are ready to start the campaign. We will take the issue you are giving to us. In the French Revolution it was "Let them eat cake," and now you are saying "let them eat pork, if they cannot buy steak." We will meet that issue. One of our colleagues said the farmer was told he should know on what side his bread is buttered. Do not overlook the farmer who was asked: "Who are you going to vote for in 1952—" and the farmer responded, "Well, I voted for Dewey twice, and I have never been so well off."

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman gave some figures on livestock production in New York compared to Nebraska. To retrieve the honors of Nebraska, will you give us the comparative figures for Nebraska and New York?

Mr. MULTER. Gentleman, I am not going to take my time answering all of those questions for you now, but I will tell you what I will do. As soon as we go back into the House I will ask for permission to put in the RECORD the complete statement of the 48 States as given to us in the bulletin, Farm Income, released June 27, 1951, by the Department of Agriculture, and I am sure you will not dispute the figures.

Mr. BUFFETT. Quote the figures in the RECORD.

Mr. MULTER. I am quoting them correctly and you can compare them and then tomorrow you can read them for yourselves. You should know them before you attempt to make these arguments.

The figures are as follows:

TABLE 4.—Cash receipts from farm marketings, by States, January–April 1950–51

[In thousands of dollars]

State and region	Livestock and products		Crops		Total	
	1950 ¹	1951 ¹	1950	1951	1950 ²	1951 ²
Maine.....	23,136	28,319	43,541	35,643	66,677	63,962
New Hampshire.....	13,730	17,333	4,568	4,855	18,298	22,188
Vermont.....	24,495	32,402	7,790	7,783	32,285	40,185
Massachusetts.....	33,517	42,427	16,981	16,058	50,498	58,485
Rhode Island.....	4,596	5,405	1,513	1,554	6,109	6,959
Connecticut.....	27,174	34,446	25,693	21,875	52,867	56,321
New York.....	170,062	214,425	57,256	59,314	227,318	273,739
New Jersey.....	52,245	69,710	14,112	15,118	66,357	84,828
Pennsylvania.....	165,550	210,767	54,685	58,024	220,235	268,791
North Atlantic region.....	514,505	655,234	226,139	220,224	740,644	875,458
Ohio.....	187,482	252,813	69,446	68,585	256,928	321,398
Indiana.....	201,448	273,466	67,714	64,948	269,162	328,414
Illinois.....	317,556	425,291	213,766	172,011	531,322	597,302
Michigan.....	119,424	154,537	61,796	54,277	181,220	208,814
Wisconsin.....	256,424	334,923	34,090	32,842	290,514	367,765
East North Central region.....	1,082,334	1,441,030	446,812	382,663	1,529,146	1,823,663
Minnesota.....	260,476	345,043	92,222	64,677	352,698	409,720
Iowa.....	511,994	694,133	129,518	96,895	641,512	791,028
Missouri.....	203,805	268,742	37,017	50,398	240,822	319,140
North Dakota.....	31,194	39,565	54,409	74,914	85,603	114,479
South Dakota.....	94,823	127,175	32,031	38,280	126,854	165,455
Nebraska.....	191,497	257,867	86,848	105,036	278,345	362,903
Kansas.....	188,022	251,965	92,027	59,542	280,049	311,507
West North Central region.....	1,481,811	1,984,490	524,072	489,742	2,005,883	2,474,232

¹ Revised.

² Includes revision for livestock and products.

TABLE 4.—Cash receipts from farm marketings, by States, January-April 1950-51—Continued
[In thousands of dollars]

State and region	Livestock and products		Crops		Total		State and region	Livestock and products		Crops		Total	
	1950 ¹	1951 ¹	1950	1951	1950 ²	1951 ²		1950 ¹	1951 ¹	1950	1951	1950 ²	1951 ²
Delaware.....	24,685	30,105	1,947	2,823	26,632	32,928	Texas.....	247,756	325,355	256,420	142,457	504,176	467,812
Maryland.....	47,713	58,334	8,451	9,614	56,164	67,948	South Central region.....	606,222	781,851	596,911	505,750	1,203,133	1,287,601
Virginia.....	57,390	72,880	39,726	43,773	97,116	116,653	Montana.....	30,911	41,445	31,657	50,512	62,568	91,957
West Virginia.....	21,098	25,476	6,192	7,874	27,290	33,350	Idaho.....	38,098	49,378	43,591	46,389	81,689	95,767
North Carolina.....	40,432	50,660	33,205	36,782	73,637	87,442	Wyoming.....	13,658	19,710	6,694	7,077	20,352	26,787
South Carolina.....	19,230	24,657	14,988	18,019	34,218	42,676	Colorado.....	88,558	111,105	49,463	44,027	138,021	155,132
Georgia.....	56,571	71,824	24,721	33,898	81,292	105,722	New Mexico.....	23,058	29,795	15,635	16,338	38,693	46,133
Florida.....	32,809	38,307	177,626	179,299	210,435	217,606	Arizona.....	25,078	31,131	46,781	64,492	71,859	95,623
South Atlantic region.....	299,928	372,243	306,856	332,082	606,784	704,325	Utah.....	28,846	37,479	7,607	7,935	36,453	45,414
Kentucky.....	67,681	88,510	112,639	92,719	180,320	181,229	Nevada.....	10,205	13,774	1,622	2,570	11,827	16,344
Tennessee.....	56,246	72,232	50,383	55,590	106,629	127,822	Washington.....	50,547	62,220	56,571	61,931	107,118	124,151
Alabama.....	37,014	45,749	18,523	29,950	55,537	75,699	Oregon.....	42,465	53,967	28,849	21,515	71,314	75,482
Mississippi.....	32,303	39,616	27,415	66,495	59,718	106,111	California.....	232,443	295,445	204,915	255,930	437,358	551,375
Arkansas.....	44,865	57,130	36,928	57,134	81,793	114,264	Western region.....	583,867	745,449	493,385	578,716	1,077,252	1,324,165
Louisiana.....	29,869	36,234	36,683	41,978	66,552	78,212	United States.....	4,568,667	5,980,297	2,594,175	2,509,177	7,162,842	8,489,474
Oklahoma.....	90,488	117,025	57,920	19,427	148,408	136,452							

¹ Revised.² Includes revision for livestock and products.

Now, let us get this quota business straight. I told you that any farmer can slaughter up to 6,000 pounds of meat a year and dispose of it freely where, when, and as he pleases. Any slaughterer who slaughters up to ten head of cattle a month is free of these quota restrictions. Do not come in here telling us how the little farmer is crying, that he needs some help. These restrictions are aimed at the big black marketeers, the big packers, who supported and financed this entire phony baloney campaign.

This quota system is not what its antagonists pretend it is. Under this quota system the Department of Agriculture determines "What did the packing houses slaughter last year?" Not the farmer, not the feeder, not the cattle raiser, but what did the slaughterer slaughter last year? Then they estimate how many cattle are coming to market today. Then OPS gives you the quota based on that. If the amount of cattle coming to market today is in excess of what it was then by 10 percent, the slaughtering quota is increased 10 percent. The idea is not to stop the farmer, not to stop the cattle raiser, not to stop the feeder, but to see to it that these cattle are channelled in to the licensed slaughterers and do not get into the black market.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Will the gentleman include in the RECORD the amount contributed by the State of New York to the Federal Government which helps support the farmers throughout the Nation?

Mr. MULTER. I think the gentleman will agree it is about 15 percent of the over-all national income. Is not that about right?

Mrs. KELLY of New York. Yes; I believe that is the amount.

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman referred to the regulation that now allows any individual to slaughter up to 6,000

pounds for his own use, also to the regulation that allows a minimum of slaughtering by a commercial slaughterer, without regard to any quota. Can the gentleman give us some assurance that if this law is passed as it is now written without any amendment, 2 months or 3 months or a year from now we will still have those same exemptions in the regulations? I understand they are regulations only and not statutory law, and that they are subject to change any day that Mr. DiSalle sees fit to change them. Can the gentleman give us any assurance that he is going to keep those regulations in effect? Can he tell us what we will have to do to keep them in effect, if we do not adopt an amendment to do it?

Mr. MULTER. If we are going to try to do more than lay down in the law the principles instead of leaving to the Department the regulation, we had better make up our minds that from here on in we are going to be a regulatory body and not a Congress. Your assurance that these regulations are going to continue to be reasonable, and reasonably enforced, is that we have reasonable-minded men in Government, and we are calling upon reasonably-minded men to try to do an honest-to-goodness job so as to protect your security and my security, the security of this country.

Now and then, here and there, we will get a man who will not do that, but I am sure we will remove him before he can do any damage. Your best assurance of future reasonableness is past reasonableness.

My experience with that man who has been so harshly and unjustly abused, Mr. DiSalle, is that he is reasonable, he is fair, he is honest, and he is decent. Any time anyone comes in and says, "This is my problem," he will sit down and go over it with him and help him if he is entitled to help.

Bear this in mind when we are talking about the quota regulation, that he can change the quota the very day it is established. If the estimate calls for a regulation that fixes it at 105 percent and actual marketing conditions show it should be 110, he can change it in 24 hours or less. He said so to the Commit-

tee on Agriculture. When conditions require the quota to be changed, he can and does change it on short notice.

Mr. POAGE. I read in this morning's paper, whether it is correct or not, that more cattle were coming to market now than at this time a year ago. I believe the gentleman read just a moment ago that the present quota on cattle is 90 percent.

Mr. MULTER. No, I did not read that.

Mr. POAGE. What is it, then?

Mr. MULTER. I cannot tell the gentleman at the moment.

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman from Texas read it, then, but the gentleman will agree it is 90 percent?

Mr. MULTER. No, I do not know what it is.

Mr. POAGE. What is it today? I am asking the gentleman, what is the quota right today?

Mr. MULTER. I refuse to yield any further. It is of no importance. No one has dared stand up here and say it is wrong. You make an argument based on supposition and imagination.

The fact of the matter is that if cattle coming to market are 10 percent over a year ago, the quota is 10 percent over a year ago for slaughtering.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Is it not true that we cannot have legislation of this type if we do not have flexible regulations to meet conditions that change practically every day?

Mr. MULTER. There is no doubt about it. Conditions change, and we have to meet the existing situation.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Will you explain why it is that if the number of cattle to be slaughtered is reduced because of the quota that that will make the price of meat cheaper to the consumer?

Mr. MULTER. The quota system is not intended to cheapen the price of

meat. Do not confuse allocations and priorities with price control. Let us keep the record clear.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. All right then, what is it for?

Mr. MULTER. The quota system is intended to keep the black marketeer out. It is intended to see that the cattle that you send and your farmers send to market reach the legitimate slaughterer and no one else.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. But you are restricting the number that the legitimate slaughterer can slaughter.

Mr. MULTER. We are restricting the number that he slaughters in accordance with the number that comes to market and the restriction is only for the purpose of allocating the cattle that come to market amongst the legitimate slaughterers and nothing else, and you cannot read anything else into that regulation.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. You do agree it raises the price, do you not?

Mr. MULTER. It does not raise the price. I do not agree.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. DOLLINGER. Reference was made before to the statement that the 1952 campaign issue will be based upon the packers' statement, "Let them eat pork"; I think the gentleman should make some correction in the RECORD so far as those of us are concerned who do not eat pork. What are we going to do?

Mr. MULTER. If this amendment prevails, we are all going to become vegetarians, whether we like it or not.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MULTER. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Your own mayor of New York, Mr. O'Dwyer, when the OPA was in effect in 1946, wired an urgent wire to the President asking him to take off controls so that the people in New York could get a little beef. You are following the same pattern here.

Mr. MULTER. No; we are not. You are.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What will you do just before the election in 1952?

Mr. MULTER. We are not following that pattern. You are following that same pattern. You are voting to take controls off. We learn by our mistakes, but you do not want to learn.

You are saying to take these controls off. You want to kill this control bill.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What will you be doing in 1952 before the election?

Mr. MULTER. You will be begging for these controls. I will say this, too, even though the President said last year he did not want these price controls, at that time the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Democrats on this side of the House voted them, with the help of some of you men, as standby controls. You can ignore the best interests of your country and of your constituents now. They will know how to respond in 1952.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Hope amendment and all amendments thereto close at 15 minutes to 5.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, can the Chair advise us how many Members are standing, indicating that they would like to be heard on the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair observes 37 or 38 Members.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the Hope amendment and all amendments thereto close at 5 o'clock.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, reserving the right to object, by unanimous consent we just allowed one member of the committee 15 or 20 minutes to argue one side of this amendment. I do not think it is fair to ask 45 or 50 people to be satisfied with three-quarters of a minute each to express some ideas that they might have on this, and therefore I will have to object to that request.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the Hope amendment and all amendments thereto conclude at 15 minutes after 5.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. SPENCE), there were—ayes 110, noes 45.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN, Mr. HOEVEN, Mr. POULSON, and Mr. GROSS yielded the time allotted to them to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES].)

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleagues for yielding me the time allotted to them. I now have 4½ or 6 minutes. The gentleman from New York who preceded me [Mr. MULTER] has just consumed about 20 minutes. Unfortunately, the gentleman from the city of Brooklyn, N. Y., is not familiar, from a practical viewpoint, as he might be with this problem.

The gentleman from New York at the close of his remarks did make a rather interesting observation when he said Mr. DiSalle under this bill could change the rules, orders, and regulations with respect to quotas on livestock at any time he may choose to do so. Of course, since he can do that to quotas he can do it with regard to other regulations. In other words, you would leave it to the head of a bureau to determine how many cattle, hogs, sheep, and other animals may, or may not, be sold in the market during any period of time.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] has pointed out, for example, that Mr. DiSalle decided the number of cattle that could be slaughtered during April of this year should be 80 percent of what the same slaughterers processed in the same month last year. On hogs I think it was 90 percent, and on sheep

80 or 90 percent. Then during the last of April he modified his orders and said the number of cattle should be 80 percent for June. Then on the last day of June he ordered the quota at 90 percent for July. That is 90 percent of the number slaughtered in July 1951. All this is being done while you complain that not enough meat is going to the retailers for the family table. And, moreover, when there is no shortage of meat animals in the country. No one, so far as I have been able to ascertain, has even suggested a shortage of cattle, hogs, or sheep.

Before I proceed further I want to make it clear that this amendment deals only with quotas. This amendment has nothing to do with prices. The only way, as I see it, where it could affect prices is that it should lower them for the reason there would be a bigger supply in competition within the market limitation.

Now, I would like to say just a word or two as to how this proposal affects the farmer and feeder who produces beef for the market. Under this legislation the farmer has no assurance from month to month, or week to week, what this Bureau may do to the market on his livestock. He has no assurance whether quotas will be manipulated upward or downward. In fact, he does not even have assurance that his livestock will be sold when they go to the public market for fear the quotas are filled and there is no market for his livestock.

Somehow, you fail to realize the feeding of cattle is a long-time operation. Many farmers in my area and in other parts of the country have already marketed cattle prematurely when they should have remained in feed lots and increased their weight and quality. In other words you would have had more meat and of better quality. Farmers take a good many long risks: weather, that is rainy or dry seasons, diseases that may injure livestock, general demands for their product when ready for market. The livestock man does not ask for subsidies. He does not want a bureau limiting the number of cattle he can sell when he is told that the demand for his product is greater than is supplied in the market place. It hardly makes sense.

I have in my district a number of cattle producers and feeders, most of whom handle only livestock in small numbers. A few of them feed on a comparatively large scale. I have in mind a feeder in my community who had a continuous program of feeding and finishing 2,000 head of cattle. Early last spring he was faced with the confusion and the uncertainty, and the further risk-quota regulations, and he sold his cattle and closed his feeding operations before the cattle were finished and ready for market. Result was loss of supply of beef because cattle were underweight.

Something was said a while ago. I believe it was the gentleman from Chicago, Ill. [Mr. YATES], about holding cattle off the market. He does not realize

the farmer cannot do that very long after they are fattened even if he would choose to do so. Feeding after they are ready for market is a losing proposition. Furthermore, when the cattle are shipped to the open market there is no guaranty of price, but they must be sold unless the owner decides to ship them back home. You just do not handle livestock you would automobiles and other similar goods. Livestock are perishable goods.

You seem to set aside the idea of supply and demand. Listen to this: A week ago last Monday I talked with the head cattle buyer for one of the big four packing companies on the Kansas City market. He said he had just bought 260 steers for slaughter for that day. He said normally he would have purchased 1,200. He said the cattle were on the market, but because of quota restrictions he could buy no more. He said there was plenty of outlet for the beef. He further stated his company would be penalized by deducting from the July quota three times his overquota for the month of June. I talked to the buyer for another of the big four and he related precisely the same story. This was on Monday when the supply of cattle on the market is usually the heaviest.

Here is another thing you fail to take into account. The quota is on the basis of the number of head of livestock and not the quantity of meat. You fail to take into account that market conditions differ from year to year. This because of weather conditions, crop conditions and other things over which the farmers have no control.

Mr. VORYS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield.

Mr. VORYS. I tried to get the Brooklyn cowboy to help me out, but he would not do so. Are the quotas the same over the whole United States, 90 percent of last year's?

Mr. REES of Kansas. That is correct. Under the order the quotas would apply the same in various parts of the country. If it is 90 percent in one area, it is 90 percent in other places.

Mr. VORYS. I may be ignorant, but let me ask: Do the cattle of the United States necessarily grow just exactly at the same percentage all over the United States?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Oh, no; not at all.

Mr. VORYS. Would it be possible for you to have a 90-percent quota in a place where cattle production was 110 percent over last year and 90 percent at another place where it is only 80 percent of last year?

Mr. REES of Kansas. There might be more cattle in an area than last year. Or there might be less cattle in a certain area than there were a year ago. Under this order the percentage quota applies the same. I was rather surprised that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] did not take cognizance of that situation when he addressed the committee earlier today.

XCVII—498

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota, who was kind enough to yield me his time on this amendment. The gentleman, incidentally, is quite familiar with this problem by reason of his own experience.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I believe it has been said that the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULTER] seriously stated in the Banking and Currency Committee that we should arrange matters so that a cow would have two calves in 1 year, without having twins. Just how that could be arranged, perhaps the gentleman from Brooklyn [Mr. MULTER] could say.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I read of it in a local newspaper.

Mr. MULTER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. If the gentleman can answer the question real quickly and say "Yes" or "No," it is all right with me.

Mr. MULTER. Is that Democrat the gentleman spoke of as having 2,000 head of cattle one of the small farmers in his district?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I did not say he was a small operator. Neither is he crying. But he is one of the men who has produced thousands of tons of beef for the people of New York and other parts of the country. He is a successful businessman just as the gentleman from New York is a highly successful lawyer. You are not hurting him by this legislation. The fellow you are injuring is the little fellow. The strange thing about it is you are talking about protecting the little packer and the little individual, but he is the man you are killing off.

Mr. MULTER. Are we killing off Armour & Co. that made only \$3,000,000 in the first quarter of this year?

Mr. REES of Kansas. The big operator the gentleman talks about is the only one, if anybody, that gets any protection under this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, fixed slaughter quotas for livestock slaughterers are impractical and unworkable of variable and unpredictable livestock receipts on the market.

Maximum farm production requires the removal of hampering uncertainties such as the proposal under consideration. If Congress deems necessary to deal with this problem at all, it ought write a clear and definite policy that farmers can depend upon. If it is done it should not hamper the farmer in his effort to do his part in producing a sufficient supply of food in this emergency. What we need is more and more production of food in this country. The farmer will do his part if you will give him a chance. Better think of meat goals, not quotas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. COLE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time

allotted me may be given to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, it is seldom that history repeats itself in 5½ years. If the gentleman from Brooklyn would look over some photostatic copies of newspaper statements I have, he might get a lesson. He would know, for instance, that cows do not have two calves in 1 year. He would know some of these things and would not have to make that statement in committee.

You know, it is very interesting, we had an OPA back in 1946. Just before the elections of that year the majority leader of this House stated, according to the newspaper:

McCORMACK urges holiday on prices.

Mr. McCORMACK also sent the following letter to the Price Administrator:

Price controls on meat and scarce food products should be suspended for 60 days. This is absolutely necessary if our hospitals and our citizens are to have sufficient meat and food supplies.

The beloved Speaker of this House, Mr. SAM RAYBURN, came down into the well of the House on May 3, 1946, and made the following statement:

I may say to the gentleman from New York and to others that I have spoken to people in high places and told them I think that cattle ought to be removed from controls.

He was honest about it.

That was in 1946 after we had had 2 years of experience in trying to do something about controlling cattle.

The Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. ANDERSON said on May 2, 1946:

Price controls on meat should be abandoned.

The President of the United States on October 14 found out they would not work and took controls off just ahead of the elections so he would not get this horse-meat Congress that the gentleman from Michigan was talking about.

The President of the United States said at that time:

I am convinced that the time has come when these controls can serve no useful purpose. I am more than convinced that their further continuance would do the Nation's economy more harm than good.

The then Secretary of Agriculture, Mr. ANDERSON, now a Member of the other body said, May 2, 1946:

Price controls on meat should be abandoned, unless a 90-day test period shows packers can get livestock in something like normal volume. This is about the last chance to make it work.

These slaughter quotas bring on the black markets. The OPS states that now 15 large black markets operate in Iowa. In 1945 and 1946 we spent \$2,000,000,000 on subsidies to help you people from Brooklyn and other places to get meat. We spent \$2,000,000,000 so

that you could get cheaper meat. Well, the meat disappeared from the market.

Mr. Chairman, I support this amendment. I think the way to get more meat is not to have a 90-percent slaughter quota but to have a 110-percent or more quota. If they say, "We want more meat," well, you just let them slaughter 110 percent and you will get more meat. This way we have no place to go with the livestock, and that is what exactly is happening here in the United States today. It is the same pattern that was followed under OPA. You will be crying in 1952 for meat. The mayor of the City of New York sent a wire to the President in 1946 saying, "Please, the people of New York are starving. We must have meat." Here is a photostatic copy of the wire. He said that meat was 40 percent higher under OPA. The only place to go was the black market.

Take heed, gentlemen, history repeats itself. These meat controls, roll-backs, and price regulations are the same pattern that brought disaster under OPA. Adopt these foolish regulations and you city people will want to know your barber and butcher better than the doctor or minister.

I support this amendment to end slaughter quotas. It was adopted in the Senate by a big vote. It was even supported by the Democratic majority leader.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. ABBITT. Mr. Chairman, it is vitally necessary at times, for the welfare of our country and our way of life, that we submit to controls by those in authority; however, I do not believe in submitting to controls just for controls' sake. The Administrator has seen fit to impose slaughter quotas on various livestock, which means that no slaughter-house can operate and continue to slaughter livestock until it secures a slaughtering quota and it cannot exceed this quota regardless of the amount of livestock available in this community.

It so happens that there is more livestock in the United States this year than it was last year and ample to meet the needs and the demand of the consumer public. In view of this, slaughtering quotas have been put on beef considerably lower than the records show for last year. I cannot believe that this action will hold down inflation or help the defense effort, nor mean cheap meat to the American people. In my opinion, it will add to the inflation, create a scarcity of meat and, in general, is harmful to the welfare of our country.

It is not contended by the Office of Price Stabilization that slaughtering quotas will in any way keep down inflation nor increase the production of livestock. The only excuse they give us for putting on slaughtering quotas is so that the Office of Price Stabilization may

have an accurate record of the livestock slaughtered.

I believe that the slaughtering quotas are more harmful than they are beneficial and for that reason I intend to vote for the amendment which prohibits the Office of Price Stabilization from imposing slaughtering quotas.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE].

(Mr. THOMPSON of Texas, Mr. GATHINGS and Mr. ABBITT asked and were given permission to yield the time allotted to them to Mr. POAGE.)

Mr. POAGE. Mr. Chairman, I feel that I cannot let go unchallenged the suggestions of the opponents of this amendment that we can safely turn the administration of this control program over to any individual or agency whoever it may be, without any direct supervision on the part of Congress and expect that agency or administrator to do the kind of job that we want done. I am not here to direct any charges against Mr. DiSalle as an individual or against anyone else as an individual, but I do think that all of us have lived long enough to know that whenever we give any governmental agency or any administrator the power of economic life and death over our people that they will exercise that power, and that unless we have provided adequate safeguards, they will exercise the power in a way that will result in the destruction of many small but fine business operations. If we leave the OPS without any rules to guide its actions, it will abuse the power granted just as certainly as will any other agency when you give it unlimited and unbridled power.

Some of the proponents of the granting of unlimited power have suggested that as yet the OPS has not destroyed everyone that it could through the exercise of this power—as yet, it still allows some reasonable exemptions in the slaughtering-quota provisions. But even the proponents of this broad grant of power admit that unless this amendment is adopted the power does exist, and that it might be exercised under this bill as it now stands at any time that the administrator saw fit to exercise it.

Is the existence of such a threat calculated to encourage any business? Do you believe that we can expect to get maximum production in the United States in any line of business if we place it in a position where it can be destroyed on a moment's notice at the whim of some bureau or administrator? True, we are told by the proponents of this measure that we do not need to limit the administrator's power because he has granted reasonable exemptions. These proponents must therefore expect us to rely on the continuation of these exemptions. If the exemptions are good, if we are supposed to rely on them, why not write them into the law?

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POAGE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. Is it not a fact that if the farmer has to keep his cattle off the market because of quota restrictions for any length of time, that the cost of the animal or the cost of the finished product goes up and must eventually be reflected in higher meat prices?

Mr. POAGE. The gentleman from Mississippi is exactly right. Of course, that is one of the fundamental errors that so many of the proponents of the regulation have made. They assume that cowmen can keep cattle without cost. They assume cowmen can strike. Of course, cowmen have not and cannot strike. But I have even heard it down home in my district where people ought to know better. I do not find it in my heart to feel unkindly toward the gentlemen from Brooklyn or New York or Chicago who do not understand the details of cattle marketing. I do feel that my own people, all of whom have at least seen a cow, and most of whom have seen stockyards, should know that if the packers in any market can only slaughter 500 head of cattle, any day that 800 head shows up in those yards there are going to be 300 head of cattle going to irregular buyers. Most of these cattle will probably go to the black market. At least these slaughtering quotas certainly are made to order to provide the black market with a convenient supply.

Unfortunately, there are all too many people who believe that all you have to do is pass a law. That you can have all the meat you want, at 10 cents a pound if you only pass a law to that effect.

Anybody who has a fourth-grade education and will think things through, and most of us will not think things through, knows that that is not true. If it were true, all we would need to do would be to just pass laws rather than work. Nobody would work because we could just pass laws. Unfortunately, you have to work to make a living in this world. Unfortunately even this Congress cannot produce meat by just passing laws. We must still rely upon economic law rather than upon statutory law. We must rely in the final analysis upon the profit motive if we are to live under the free economic system which we believe is best.

If you are not going to rely on the profit motive, you must substitute some other motive if you are to get any production. If you take away the hope of a profit, you have to adopt the Russian system, under which the motive for production is compulsion. There just is no choice. There are only two ways to get people to produce meat or any other food. One way is by giving a man the hope he can make a profit. That is the American way. That is the way which has worked. The other way is by assuring him that he is going to be thrown into jail or the salt mines if he does not produce the meat or the other food the government orders him to produce. This is the Russian system. This is the way which has pulled everybody down to a common level of misery. I believe our

American system works the best, and I think most of us believe it. So let us stay with it.

I want to talk a moment about a fundamental principle that is involved in this matter of marketing quotas. When the gentleman insists that slaughtering quotas are necessary in the market place in order to properly distribute the meat that is coming in, he must follow that logically by an admission that quotas are going to be necessary in the butcher shop and in the grocery store, and that the housewife is inevitably going to have to carry little red meat coupons with her again. We are just as certain to have consumer rationing on meat as we are that we have quotas in the stockyards. You are not going to have the one and have it work fairly without the other. You are going to have consumer rationing just as surely as you continue the course that is now being pursued by the Office of Price Stabilization.

Do not let anybody fool you. All of this is pure eyewash when these people come along and talk to you about how they are going to lower the price of meat, reduce the amount of meat coming through the packing plants, and still let everybody buy all they want to at a low price. It cannot be done, and I do not think we are fair with the American people if we encourage them to believe it is possible. The fact that there was not enough meat to equal the demand even at high prices is the only reason that the price of meat went so high. People were willing to pay the high price in order to get it. There was not enough to supply everybody with all he wanted. None of these regulations are going to produce an extra pound of beef. How, then, can we honestly hold onto the hope that we can supply everyone who wants beef with all he would like to buy? If the price does go down it will surely increase, not decrease, the demand for beef. It will make less, not more, beef to be divided. If we slaughter only 80 percent or 90 percent as much beef as we did last year, who is going to get that beef? Will the first housewife to the butcher shop get all she wants and the latecomers get none? My colleagues, you know that there is but one answer. If you reduce the number of cattle slaughtered in the legitimate market, you inevitably force rationing in the butcher shop—and you drive the cattle that the legitimate packer could not buy into the black-market channels.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS].

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, the idea of establishing slaughtering quotas is far removed from the American idea of justice. It gives to those who may have a quota now a vested right to continue in business, and it shuts the door to everyone else. It will result in higher prices of meat. If you reduce the amount of meat that is to be distributed by lowering the slaughtering quotas, that meat is going to be

higher. It will send more meat into the black market.

What does this country lose when we follow a course that builds up the black market? In the first place, this clandestine slaughtering means that the Nation loses the important medicines that are byproducts of the packing industry. We strike fear into the hearts of thousands of people in the country because of the shortage of vital medicines. When we restrict the amount of meat that can be slaughtered in ordinary channels, we send it to the slaughtering sources where the Federal Government loses the taxes involved.

(By unanimous consent the time allotted to Mr. CLEMENTE was granted to Mr. SPENCE.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. MCCARTHY].

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted to Mr. ZABLOCKI, Mr. DOLLINGER, Mr. CHUDOFF, Mrs. BOSONE, and Mr. BARRATT was given to Mr. MCCARTHY.)

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I assume the House really wants to know how a quota is determined and why it is determined. Some Members who have spoken before me know very well what the purpose of the quota is and how it is determined. I do not think there is much excuse for their having left the House in confusion on that point. They have stated that the quota has the effect of preventing the farmers from marketing their livestock when it is ready to go to market. Let me explain to you just how a quota is determined.

The United States Department of Agriculture gives the Office of Price Stabilization an estimate of the number of cattle, calves, hogs, sheep, and lambs that may come to market in the next month. In other words, the Department estimates how much livestock would come into the market even if we had a free market operating. Then, this estimate is expressed in terms of a percentage of the amount of the same kind of livestock marketed in the same month of the preceding year.

So, if they estimate for a free market—that is, if the Department of Agriculture estimates that in a free market 110 percent, in terms of the number of cattle, would be marketed in the month of July, over what was marketed in that month a year ago, the Department sets the quota at 110 percent. If they estimate that in the operation of a free market with no controls and no restraints, only 90 percent as many cattle are going to be marketed, then they set the quota at 90 percent for the month of July. Then the OPS sets its quotas roughly in line with the United States Department of Agriculture estimate. That is the first step. That is how it is set up.

Now the next question is why is it set up? It is set up chiefly to protect all packers and slaughterers who are licensed. The quota simply means that if you are a licensed packer you have the right to buy 90 percent of what you

slaughtered in the same month of the previous year. If you are a licensed big packer you can buy 90 percent, and if you are a small packer who is licensed you get 90 percent.

A previous speaker asked the question, Why do they not set the quota at 110 percent? To set the quota at 110 would have no effect unless the Government were to go out and force the farmers to market their livestock to meet the quota. Understand, this quota is simply an estimate of the number of cattle that would come into the market if we had a free market operating. It is set up in order to insure each packer's getting his fair share of the livestock marketed.

There is one more point I would like to make. There is no official intent to reduce the marketings by the use of quotas. I will quote now from a farm letter of Mr. Wayne Darrow of June 2, 1951, and his is the proper interpretation:

There is no official intent to reduce marketings by the use of quotas.

The only intention is to get a fair distribution of livestock that comes into the market.

Now, just to show you how this quota system has been misunderstood and misrepresented, let me quote from another farm letter which goes out of Washington, the Washington Farm Reporter, May 26, edited by Fred Bailey. He says:

The June slaughter quotas are due out soon and will call for another reduction in the slaughter of beef cattle.

Now, the quota has nothing to do with reduction of slaughtering. It is simply an estimate of the number of cattle that will come into the market, into a free market. Mr. Bailey and a number of Members who have spoken say it calls for reduction. It does not call for a reduction. It simply is an estimate of the percent of livestock which will come into the market this month and a determination that each packer shall get his fair share.

The quota is not something that is fixed. I would like to point out to you that if it is found that the estimated quota is wrong, it can be changed and Mr. DiSalle said this before the Committee on Agriculture, as I recall, "we can change the quota in 24 hours."

Now, to make the point clearer, the OPS made two upward quota adjustments in the month of May, one in Minnesota and in Wisconsin when calf marketings exceeded the 80 percent quota, and one in the Missouri River marketings when hog marketings ran 120 to 123 percent of May 1950. They adjusted it upward to meet the actual marketing supply.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I yield.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Suppose there are some individuals who would like to start a new slaughtering plant; how are they going to get a quota?

Mr. MCCARTHY. They are not going to get a quota, because they are not licensed.

Mr. CURTIS of Nebraska. Why should they not get a license?

Mr. McCARTHY. Because we are trying to establish some kind of order. Does the cotton farmer under the allotment program get a permit to grow cotton when he has not done it before? No. We say that we have to establish some kind of order. What about the tobacco grower under the allotment program? If he has a history of growing cotton or a history of growing tobacco or a history of growing peanuts, he will get his quota. If not, he gets nothing.

I do not yield further now.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I promised to yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman says the quota does not limit the production.

Mr. McCARTHY. I said it is not set up as a limitation. It might have that effect late in the month, but OPS can make adjustments.

Mr. HOPE. The gentleman says they can change it in 24 hours, but I call attention to the fact that one day last week they had a run of hogs in Kansas City. The receipt of hogs was 5,400, which has been exceeded only once this year. The news account of that situation says:

A liberal number of hogs was shipped elsewhere for slaughter. A restricted slaughter quota announced for this month was a factor in the lower prices and the shipper movement. The OPS cut the hog quota from 115 percent to 105 percent of a year ago.

Mr. McCARTHY. I think I have the gentleman's point. I know that there have been temporary dislocations. However, the information has been left here today that under the quota system there is a possibility that there will be livestock left over. It has even been suggested that we will have to burn the surplus pigs. This is ridiculous. There will be 100 percent sale and slaughter of all the livestock that the farmers wish to sell. The quota as I have said before is simply an estimate of the percent of last year's monthly supply that is expected to be put on the market during the same month of this year. In 1 month it may be 80 percent, in another month it may be 120 percent or 130 percent, or even 150 percent. In any case, I repeat, in the course of the year, 100 percent of all livestock which farmers wish to sell, can be sold. There has been much concern expressed here today that beef cattle have not been coming into the market. The fixing of quota has had no bearing on this fact. Anyone who is considering this livestock question today should know that it takes approximately 3 years to produce a first-grade steer from breeding to slaughter. The decision to increase the supply of beef must be made several years in advance of the actual increase in the supply on the market. During 1949, when the farm price of cattle averaged \$19.90 per hundredweight, cattlemen added 1,800,000 head to their herds. During

1950 when they were getting approximately \$23.10 per hundredweight producers increased their herds by 4,100,000 head. If beef is not coming to the market today, it is not because of the quota system. It is due to any one or a combination of these factors. Either the cattlemen are holding them off the market in the hope that the roll-back may be repealed or prices increased. They are holding them off because the cattle are not ready for the market or they may be withholding breeding stock in order to increase the size of the marketable beef a year from now or 2 years from now. Some of the members who have spoken advocating quotas of 110 or 120 seem to think that by fixing such a quota it will follow in some miraculous manner that more beef will be put on the market. I do hope that they are not advocating that the cattle growers be forced to market their cattle in order to bring the price of beef down. I am sure that no one here wants to force the farmers of this country to market their cattle contrary to their own wishes. On the other hand, it is not the purpose of the quota to keep them from marketing the cattle before they wish to.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. I just wanted to call attention to the fact that the setting of quotas for people on historical records is what is being done right now throughout industry. All of the short metals are allocated on the basis of percentage to historical use. If a new user wants to come in and use steel or aluminum, he cannot get an allocation. He just does not go into the business. It is a recognition of the fact that we are in an emergency and such materials as we have must be allocated fairly. They allocate them to the people who have a record of prior use, and that is the only fair way to work it out.

Mr. McCARTHY. The gentleman is absolutely right. We have been using it in the farm program.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Absolutely. It is nothing new.

Mr. WHITTEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McCARTHY. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTEN. I know the gentleman wants to be fair, and certainly my question is directed in that way, but the comparison you draw between cotton controls and tobacco controls, while I think they are proper, giving the permission to stay in business to the packer, is similar, I do think you have pointed your finger at the chief weakness of this approach of having controls on slaughtering, because in that case it is a question of having too large a supply and your purpose is to hold down production. I think in this instance, where the supply is short, you are falling into the same mistake.

Mr. McCARTHY. I do not yield further. The gentleman is confusing the picture again, because the quota does not

have as its purpose any reduction. The over-all purpose is simply to provide an orderly workable procedure so that every packer who has a license can get his fair share of the available supply.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Chairman, I am not an economist, but when Mr. DiSalle tells us that the quota system on slaughtering is just an administrative device to control the black market, it is difficult for me to go along with him. To me it seems when you have a limitation on what a packer can slaughter it limits the supply that he can buy; and when he is limited to 90 percent in his purchases as against the supply of last year, that limits the supply of meat that he can sell through legitimate channels of trade.

Mr. JENSEN. And they adhere to it.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And there is a strict penalty enforced against the packer when he is out of compliance. So rather than go into the market and buy the supply that is on the market he limits his purchasing in order to keep away from penalties.

When the packer goes into the registered market to buy livestock, he faces stiff competition for the cattle from numerous order-buyers. These order-buyers have received orders from all parts of the country for cattle and other livestock. Some of the livestock purchased by order-buyers may go into the black market. The packer is forced to stay in compliance for his quota and price paid for livestock established by the OPS. He dare not bid up the price because of the penalties involved. In view of this situation some of the livestock purchased by order-buyers will pass into black-market channels, and the supply of meat through legitimate channels will be reduced for the consumers, and result in higher consumer prices.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired.

(Mr. GAMBLE and Mr. WOLCOTT asked and were given permission to yield their time to Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN.)

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 3 minutes additional.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Now we have 5,000,000 more people in the United States than we had last year—155,000,000 people at the present time, according to the Census Bureau, so we need more meat rather than less. The livestock population of the United States has increased around 3,000,000, I am told by the Department of Agriculture, in the last year.

Now if you want to provide more meat to the people through legitimate channels you should adopt the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas so that slaughtering may be increased over and above the quota.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield. Mr. JENKINS. I have one packing house in my district; it is quite a considerable operation. What the gentle-

man mentioned a few minutes ago is exactly their experience.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. And unless we take this action we are going to find the same situation we found in the last part of 1946 and early 1947 where 80 percent of the beef which was sold in this country went through black-market channels and at black-market prices.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted to me may be given to the gentleman from Minnesota.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. TALLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I must yield to the gentleman who so kindly yielded me his time.

Mr. TALLE. I cannot resist recalling the testimony that was given before the Committee on Banking and Currency in the closing days of World War II. We were talking about black-market operations, so much of the meat then was going into the black market. I remember one witness, a gentleman from Texas, said we could not control slaughtering because people could slaughter wherever there was a tree and a brook. He added: "In the United States there are a lot of trees and a lot of brooks." The Congress should not encourage black-market operations.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I was a member of the so-called Anderson committee in 1946 that was headed by the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, who later became Secretary of Agriculture. We had hearings in the great city of New York about the meat situation. You should have been with us at that time, because 80 to 90 percent of the meat sold in New York City was sold at black-market prices.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. McCARTHY] admitted that there would be dislocations in this quota deal. Who is going to compensate the farmers and raisers of livestock such as the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] cited where they have 5,000 head that they cannot absorb in the Kansas City market and had to be shipped somewhere else? Who is going to compensate the farmer for the loss in shipping?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. There will be nobody to compensate the farmer for that loss; he must take that loss himself; and the consumers of the country will pay higher prices because the meat will not flow into normal channels of trade.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Does the gentleman recall any black-market operations in a free market?

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. No, of course not. There is no incentive for the

black-market operator to operate on a free market.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER].

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, I was very much impressed earlier by the remarks of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES]. I have a letter here from a concern that is not in the gentleman's district which came to my office today. It is awfully close to the district represented by the gentleman from Illinois. This is from a small packer who says:

We own and operate a small pork-processing plant in Chicago under BAI inspection. Due to the irregularities created by a low base period, we were frozen in a loss position.

So far this year our operation shows a loss of \$16,386.25 as of June 16, 1951, compared to a profit of \$54,724.41 as of June 17, 1950.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] probably received the same letter in this morning's mail.

May I say that it does not make much difference whether you proceed under this plan or this plan over there, you will have a black market. There will be a certain number of people go into the black-market business. But I believe this one over here will work a little bit better for one or two reasons.

The people, as was demonstrated here by the gentleman from Nebraska, take their livestock down to the processing yard and there is no legal sale to be made because the quota has been filled for that day. That man is going to sell his on the black market, although ordinarily he is not that kind of a fellow.

A lot of the gentlemen over on the opposition side, have been for small business. It seems to me you are going to drive the small packer and the small processor out of business if you adopt this procedure, because the small fellows have a margin of only 10 to 20 percent with which to operate on and when we have this kind of 80-percent business it will make it impossible for them to operate at a profit.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the time allotted me may be given to the gentleman from New York [Mr. JAVITS].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. Chairman, there are a certain number of Members of this House who are against direct controls and whether we adopt this amendment or not they are going to vote against the bill. A great many of those have been speaking.

This particular amendment affects the rest of us, who I hope are in a majority in the House, who are going to support the controls bill and want it to be fair.

Nothing has been said about the fact that there is no other practical way of controlling the slaughterer than by the quota system. There is no licensing provision in the Defense Production Act or under this bill except under this quota system. That is the only way to keep our hands on the slaughterer; therefore, it seems to me strange that the argument is made that if we do not keep our hands on him by defeating this amendment we are going to have less rather than more black-marketing operations. It seems to me that if we deprive ourselves of the ability to keep our hands on him that is the very way to get more rather than less of black-market meat—the very thing we want to avoid.

The only real control over meat that is linked to price control is the control of the slaughterer. There is no rationing of meat and it seems to me if we want to avoid rationing—and I think many of us certainly want to—we need to have this kind of control at the source rather than to take it off. To defeat this amendment is the way to get less control rather than more control.

I think all of the arguments in support of this amendment, other than from those who are just against direct controls, head up to the fear that some unreasonable regulation will be made by the Price Administrator. I think it would be perfectly fair to insert an amendment to the bill writing into the last section of the act, section 716, a provision that the Congress shall have residual control, to be exercised by concurrent resolution, not only over the act and the sections of the act but also over the regulations, rules, and orders and amendments to them issued under the act's authority.

So, if we feel that regulations may become arbitrary or discriminatory or block out new producers—and I am against that, too; I think there must be quotas available for new producers and small producers—then we always have the residual power in the Congress to correct that situation. If we are in favor of the fundamental principle of direct controls, we have a right to the protection that regulations shall not be arbitrary or capricious.

Otherwise, I can see this amendment to bar slaughterer's quotas as nothing else but a further effort to dilute the opportunity to really make price controls stick and make them strong. I think if we have this protection against arbitrary and unreasonable regulations, we protect ourselves fully against anything the Administrator may do which would be unfair.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JAVITS. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOPE. Is it not a fact that the Department of Agriculture at the present time licenses all packers of this country and that all of the States have sanitary regulations which require conformance by the packers?

Mr. JAVITS. Yes, but this right to establish slaughterer's quotas, barred by this amendment, ties what is in effect licensing to this price stabilization law, to compliance with this law and to operation under this law, and that is exactly why I say that we would have less regulation of black markets in meat rather than more unless we defeat the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, first let me say to my colleague the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SPRINGER] that I, too, received this morning the letter he quoted, and that I am as interested as he is in protecting the small packer. I believe, however, that the way to protect the small packer under a system of price controls is through the quota system established by the Office of Price Stabilization. Of course, if we are to have no price controls, there is no need for such a quota system, but inasmuch as I believe such controls on food prices are essential at this time, I shall oppose this amendment.

There has been much talk during these debates of packers, of farmers, and of slaughterers. Nobody has mentioned the consumer. Apparently, the great American consumer is the forgotten man, and little attention is being given to his needs, his interests, and his rights. As I listen to this debate, I cannot avoid the feeling that the raid is on—that this debate should be called the great gold rush of 1951, and just as prospectors raced to file their claims in the gold fields of California in 1849, so today and during the days to come claims are being staked right now in the pockets of the American consumers. Earlier today the oil and fat interests staked out their claims. This amendment is the claim being staked out by the beef and livestock interests, and I am sure that later on the cotton people and the other agricultural interests will drive through amendments to assure their participation in the apparently rich lode in the pockets of the consumers. And this, Mr. Chairman, is without benefit of any kind of depletion allowance for the consumer, which most of the same gentlemen insist is necessary for those engaged in the mining and oil industries in our Nation. On the contrary, they would fix the wages and earnings of the consumers at present levels, unrealistic levels in the face of the increases in food costs which are inevitable with the elimination of price controls on food products.

This is a game of "heads I win; tails you lose," and the American consumer is always the loser. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. POAGE] a few moments ago stated that increased production will compel a reduction in prices and that we cannot get it under a controls system. This attitude truly fails to take into account the realities of our farm program, of which he is such a champion, because no matter how much production is achieved there will never be a substan-

tial reduction in farm prices because of price supports. Two years ago we had a surplus in almost all agricultural commodities, but the prices could not go down because of price supports. Then we had the case of "heads I win," because the consumer-taxpayers had to pay the costs of sustaining support prices. Now we are faced with shortages in such commodities, and we have the case of "tails you lose," because when the gentlemen insist that farm prices should have no ceilings in an economy which controls other prices and earnings, again the consumers must pay.

Mr. Chairman, this insistence upon special privilege for one segment of our economy is not only unfair; it is positively immoral. This is a time which demands equal sacrifice from all of our people, from the farmers as well as the city dwellers, from the producers as well as the consumers. You cannot in good conscience compel the consumers to shoulder a discriminatory and disproportionate share of the burden.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD].

AGAINST SLAUGHTERING RESTRICTIONS

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, when a farmer takes his produce to the market and sells it, he at that moment collects his wage; he does not collect it at any other time. The debate this afternoon has indicated that a farmer should not collect the highest wage he can. That amazes me coming from Members of a body like this. On what grounds can you ask a farmer to cut the income of his family on which his wife and children depend, simply to sell meat below a price which he can get? Unless this amendment is adopted, this program will drive the farmer into the black market in order to maintain his wage, and he is entitled, to maintain that wage just the same as any union member in industry is entitled to maintain his wage under a collective-bargaining agreement. By what line of reasoning would you have the farmer cut his wage and at the same time allow advances in wages of union workers? Over 800 farmers in my district and a lot of city people have written me to oppose the controls which have been pushed against them, and less than 40 have asked me to support the control program. Naturally, on the basis of my common sense and ordinary judgment, plus the support of my people, I will oppose the controls as called for by this bill and support the Hope amendment to remove slaughtering restrictions.

(Mr. HAYS of Ohio and Mr. GREEN asked and were given permission to yield the time allotted to them to Mr. SPENCE.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. RODINO].

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks at this point, and to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING].

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

CONGRESS IN CRISIS

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Chairman, a few days ago we celebrated July Fourth, Independence Day. Many of us were back home making patriotic speeches to the folks in our districts, discussing the needs of the day in terms of the historical traditions of our great Nation. It is very likely that in discussing the concept of a free America which reached its fateful achievement for the first time 175 years ago, we in the Congress developed somewhere in our themes the place of the Congress in protecting the rights of the American people, in safeguarding their liberties, in legislating in the interests of the whole people.

Mr. Chairman, we have every right to stress the fundamental role of Congress in safeguarding the public interest. That role is basic. But how a particular Congress might stand up to its responsibilities is sometimes something altogether different from the basic role, the basic concept.

Congresses are judged, Mr. Chairman, by the manner in which they react in time of stress, in time of crisis. This Congress is a Congress in crisis. This bill now before us, the Defense Production Act, is a measure which is a test of our resolve to stand up to our responsibilities.

Will we examine this bill objectively, Mr. Chairman, and study its provisions carefully, and, in view of world conditions we recognize as difficult and dangerous, lend our support unstintingly to the crusade launched by this great Nation in defense throughout the world of the freedom we ourselves inherited from the bravery and resolution of Americans 175 years ago? Or will we turn and run? Will we find good reasons to overcome our collective conscience and, instead of what is right and necessary, vote for those things politically most palatable?

Actually, there is no real dilemma for us on that question. The best politics, as I think we have all learned, is government in the public interest—in the interest of all of the people. Special interests and special pleaders may rend the air with threats of the reprisals they can command at election day, but the fact remains that when the people have the facts, the special pleaders fight a losing vendetta at the polls.

Mr. Chairman, in this fight over decent price control and anti-inflation legislation, the facts will not be suppressed; the people will know the facts. This legislation cannot help but become increasingly important as a public issue as time goes by and as the inflationary pressures we know are ahead in the next few years begin to bear down hard on the purchasing power and the standard of living of my constituents and those of every other Member of Congress.

This bill is not the perfect anti-inflation bill. In my opinion, it has some

serious faults. As it has come from the Committee on Banking and Currency after exhaustive hearings and, I am sure, sympathetic consideration, it leaves big gaps in the line against inflation. I shall vote to strengthen it in every possible respect. I shall vote to insure against inflation wrecking our economy. But whether or not my views prevail on every clause or section or amendment, I want to be able to tell my constituents, Mr. Chairman, that 175 years after the freedom of America was proclaimed, the Congress of the United States was not unmindful of its duties and its obligations to the people of this democracy in time of crisis.

The people of my district are not apathetic about this legislation, Mr. Chairman, and, frankly, I do not think the people anywhere else in the United States are apathetic either. Some Members of Congress may not have received any floods of mail about price control—except from those special-interest groups trying to destroy it—but the people in my district have made clear in no uncertain terms how they feel about the need for protection against inflation in this emergency.

They know what has happened to the price of milk in the Newark area in the year since the start of the Korean war—up more than 16 percent. More than 16 percent—think of it. A loaf of bread in the vicinity of Newark today costs nearly 12 percent more than it did a year ago. Who gets that extra money—the farmer? Not at all. We have learned to our chagrin in the Congress that when the price of grain goes up 50 cents or a dollar a bushel, the price of bread inevitably has to go up, too, because we are told, of increased grain costs. And then, when the price of grain goes down a dollar or so a bushel, does the price of bread go down, too? Not at all. We are then told that the cost of the grain is such a small proportion of the cost of making a loaf of bread that a decrease of even 33 percent or more in the price of grain is not enough to be reflected by a decrease in the cost of a loaf of bread.

It is only when the price of grain goes up, it appears, that grain suddenly becomes an important cost item in bread-making.

That is the kind of economic double-talk my constituents are getting fed up with. And getting fed up on economic nonsense is no substitute for getting the foods they need at prices they can afford.

Mr. Chairman, when the National Association of Manufacturers comes in here and turns its multi-million-dollar lobby loose to kill price controls, we need only remember the promises of that organization in 1946—kill price control, it said, and there will be plenty of roast beef, plenty of butter, plenty of everything for everybody at prices the people can afford to pay.

And the Congress did, in fact, kill price control. Not with a straight clean blow, but by slow torture until of necessity it collapsed and died. And what happened? The black markets in meat

which the NAM had talked so glibly about ending merely by ending price control suddenly turned into legalized robbery instead of the criminal kind. Before a year had passed, black-market prices for meat were put to shame by the exorbitant legal prices shamelessly charged by the meat trust in the great era of an unbridled economic free-for-all let loose by the death of price control.

Round steak by 1947 had shot up to 84 cents a pound, which was 18 cents a pound higher than the black-market price in OPA days—and most Americans did not patronize black markets during OPA no matter what the pressure groups say.

And where is round steak today? It went up to \$1.02 in Newark on the average a year ago—right before Korea. The last official figure from the Bureau of Labor Statistics on meat prices in Newark is for April, when the price was 11 percent higher than pre-Korea—\$1.14 a pound. And as everyone knows, it went even higher than that and it is still higher.

In this anti-roll-back amendment voted by the House Banking and Currency Committee, the price of beef in Newark cannot go any lower and will probably have to go even higher.

Where is the justice, Mr. Chairman, the fairness, the decency in that? What are my people to do? There is one thing they can do if the Congress refuses to cut out this profiteering with an effective price-control statute, and that is demand higher and higher pay to keep up with the spiraling cost of living.

Mr. Chairman, I am fully aware that there are a great many fair-minded and considerate people in the district which I represent. They realize the need for effective controls, too. These people are patriotic, unselfish, and willing to make their contribution to the defense effort. However, as they have expressed it to me, they seek fair and equitable treatment. They believe that if we are to continue controls, we should hold the line all over and not give way to certain preferred groups. And they are right. For, unless these controls are effective and across the board, the result would be penalizing those who voluntarily refrained from raising prices and rewarding those who jacked up prices unreasonably prior to the general price freeze.

This inequality of treatment might wreck the whole price-control program by making it impossible for the control agencies to lower the ceiling prices of beef, clothing, shoes, and other essential living-cost items. This would further destroy belief in the efficacy of price controls.

Therefore, once again we must decide which is to be put first, the national interest or the special interest.

And, in this defense emergency, if they put selfishness first the way a lot of special interests are doing, they will get higher and higher pay rates and the whole stabilization program will go out the window.

With higher rents recommended in this bill, with the proposal that beef prices be regarded as sacred and secure against any roll-backs, with butter up somewhere between 80 and 90 cents a pound and coffee selling at nearly \$1, with a shortage of decent accommodations that people can afford to buy or rent, and with profits at shamefully high levels—while wage rates remain virtually frozen—there is bound to be an explosion in this economy that will rock the whole country at a time of crisis.

The press will scream about labor imperiling the defense effort. But the people will not be fooled by the sound and fury—if this Congress today, this week, on this bill, caves in and gives in to the profiteers wanting their pound of the people's flesh.

The time to prevent unrest and resentment and a lowering of morale that would weaken our defense effort is right now. It must be the best price-control bill we can devise.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BOLLING].

(Mr. MITCHELL asked and was given permission to yield the time allotted to him to Mr. BOLLING.)

Mr. BOLLING. Mr. Chairman, I think I have heard more piety here this afternoon than in some time. It is very clear that everybody is for everybody else. We are anxious to do the best thing we can for our country but we are going to be sure to take care of our own constituents regardless of what happens to the rest of the country.

Let us take off our false whiskers. It is quite clear what we are doing if we vote for elimination of this slaughter quota provision. If we do that, we will knock out any effective control over black markets. If we do that we will in effect knock out any chance of effective price control on meat. We are, by voting to knock out slaughter quotas, which is a technique to insure equitable distribution and nothing else, in effect making it entirely clear that we do not want to serve the country as a whole and have fair and equitable prices on meat.

It seems to me a little ridiculous for those who would defend their own to come in here with piety defending 152 percent of parity. It seems to me wise for the gentlemen to take thought. It may well be that the other farmers in the country will resent the fact that the beef producers have said over and over again that parity means nothing. I think we might pause briefly if we are interested in the long-run welfare of our constituents as well as of the country as a whole to see what we are doing.

The exact reverse of the process undertaken by the Office of Price Stabilization took place under the Office of Price Administration during the last war. OPA failed to establish slaughter quotas until quite late in the game. As a result, when they did, they legalized a number of black marketers who had come in before slaughter quotas were

established. If we eliminate the slaughter quota provision, we are sure to have an indefinite number of those black-market trees and those black-market barns and those black-market streams used to the detriment of the American people, detrimental from the point of view of sanitation and detrimental from the point of view of all the very important byproducts.

Let us quit kidding ourselves, if we are, and certainly let us quit trying to kid the public.

THE CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. HAND].

Mr. HAND. Mr. Chairman, the Hope amendment seeks to prevent the OPS from the further use of the quota system. It is as simple as that. It has nothing whatever to do with price controls, and I feel very strongly that the amendment should be adopted.

No doubt the OPS, in establishing quotas, are seeking to regulate the orderly production and distribution of meat. The difficulty is, as in so many cases where we tamper with the national economy, it is impossible to work justice. A notable example has recently arisen in my own district. A packing plant quite recently established, or perhaps I should say, revived, was assigned a quota of 2,754,000 pounds of swine annually. This plant has modern facilities for production and employs 22 persons. The quota allowed is not sufficient to keep them operating even at half time. The union labor in the plant quite properly insists upon full-time employment. Under the quota allowed the plant cannot operate. While waiting for an adjustment from OPS, the management is literally paying men for doing nothing.

What will be the net result?

First. The capital invested in the plant will be lost.

Second. The employees of the plant will lose profitable employment.

Third. A substantial quantity of meat will be lost to production and to normal and lawful markets.

Fourth. A significant percentage of that meat will eventually go into the black market.

Mr. Chairman, this kind of a system just will not work.

I am just hopeful enough to believe that Mr. Gregg of OPS intends to try at least to make an equitable adjustment of this situation. His office has dealt with me courteously. The fact remains that the quota system is a bad one, will indirectly lead to inflated prices by restricting production and by diverting meat into the black market under unsanitary and expensive conditions.

The farmers of my area have no other convenient market place to deliver their stock. I am no expert, but I know you cannot continue feeding a hog after it is ready for the market without inviting bankruptcy. The authority to establish quotas is one which cannot be worked out with equity and justice, and defeats the very purpose of the Defense Production Act.

Mr. Chairman, I am including herewith a few of the communications I have from my district on this problem as follows:

JULY 3, 1951.

Congressman HAND,
Second District, New Jersey,
House of Congress Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Wildwood Packing Co., Rio Grande. Important market, our swine. We do not want to lose it. We find Manager Dresnin honest and square. This custom slaughterer Cape May asset. Employees trained since last July not willing, remain half-time jobs because full work at beach. OPS has refused appeal thinking Dresnin greedy, selfish motives. Quota 200,000 pounds swine weekly and no cattle. Could continue operate.

CAPE MAY COUNTY BOARD OF AGRICULTURE,
RUSSELL TAYLOR, President.
Rural Delivery, Cape May.

CAPE MAY COUNTY
CHAMBER OF COMMERCE,
Wildwood, N. J., July 7, 1951.

Hon. T. MILLET HAND,
Member of Congress, Second District,
New Jersey, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HAND: It has been called to our attention that the quota given by OPS to the Wildwood Packing Co., at Rio Grande, is not of sufficient size to permit continued operation.

The plant is still open, running at a loss in hope of securing adjustment upward. Without going into long detail it is easy to see that a force of men cannot be held together with work occupying 2 or 3 days per week.

This custom slaughterhouse is presently well run and is a real asset to Cape May County. Any aid which you can give Harry Dresnin, manager, in securing favorable answer to his hardship appeal will be greatly appreciated.

T. B. HAMM, President
(For the County Chamber of Commerce).

Finally I want to include a very illuminating letter from the official government of the County of Cape May written by the Honorable Walter H. Treen, a director of the board of chosen freeholders. This explains the situation concisely.

BOARD OF CHOSEN FREEHOLDERS,
COUNTY OF CAPE MAY, N. J.,
July 6, 1951.

Hon. T. MILLET HAND,
Member of Congress, Second District,
New Jersey, House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MILLET: Upon a request of a farmer, Allan McClain, of Green Creek, I called at the Wildwood Packing Co., Rio Grande, N. J., July 3. I also consulted with Henry White, the agricultural agent of Cape May County, who has had many talks with Harry Dresnin.

The Wildwood Packing Co. was purchased by the present owners in December 1949, being acquired for the slaughter of swine. During the first 9 months or so, cattle were slaughtered to keep the plant operating, and plant changes were being made so hogs could be handled efficiently. Cattle were slaughtered during the period of January 7, 1950, to September 23, 1950, and none since. Slaughter of swine began in a small way July 15, 1950, when 255 head per week were killed. Mr. Harry Dresnin became manager in September 1950, at which time the output increased.

Very soon thereafter, the plant became unionized, and the union requiring full-time

work for the men. Working 40 hours per week the union output was up to 950 head per week (188,100 pounds) before the end of 1950 and has been above 200,000 pounds weekly many times since. With the union demanding full-time work and with plenty of employment available at the beaches, the OPS, which is too small for even half-time work in July, will apparently force this plant to close. Mr. Dresnin has been paying help for not working while trying to hold the men until the quota matter is settled.

Dresnin reported to Mr. White that he is not interested in any quota of cattle. He is set up for hog slaughter and he would not consider a cattle slaughter at all, except as a last resort to keep the plant open if the OPS refuses to adjust the swine quota upward.

The OPS, seeking orderly marketing of meat products, uses formulae much to the disadvantage of the Wildwood Packing Co. Quotas given are based on past history. Here is a custom slaughterhouse, specializing in swine, with quota based on a period when a start was being made, assembly-line methods being installed, and local men being trained.

The OPS calls the plant's capacity 168,000 pounds per week (8,777,600 per year) and grants 75-percent quota (6,583,000 pounds per year) with only 85,000 for July and 115,000 for August. The plant operates on a charge of 1 percent per pound. When 200,000 pounds are killed weekly the income is \$2,000. I understand the weekly costs of labor and operating overhead amount to \$1,800 per week. It is very apparent then that operating with the July quota of 85,000 pounds with the income of \$850 would leave considerable deficit in operation.

Farmers of our county have been working to adjust their farms to crops which meet modern requirements. Beans, a good crop, occupy too many acres. One solution has been to shift to more swine. Among the larger growers in this area are McClain, Walter Barber & Son, John Hall, and the Germanio's. The Wildwood Packing Co. has purchased these locally produced hogs on the basis of the day's market price. Farmers in this area have found this outlet superior to the Woodstown and more-distant markets. They feel that it will hurt this enlarging animal industry to lose this company.

I understand that you have kindly sought to aid the Wildwood Packing Co. in this situation. If you can do anything further, I would appreciate it. I have been interested in the industries for Cape May County and here is one that the farmers say is well run and is important to them. I sincerely hope that OPS can be convinced that Dresnin's requests are sincere and honest, and not an attempt to override an agency which is seeking orderly marketing of swine during a national emergency.

Kind personal regards.

Yours truly,

WATER H. TREEN.

Mr. Chairman, during the course of this debate some Members have qualified as experts on this subject and others have pretended to be. I make no such pretense, but I think that the facts in this case are very clear, and that this recitation makes some contribution to the discussion of the question.

I trust that the Hope amendment will be adopted in the interest of equity and justice, and indeed in the interest of fair emergency legislation.

THE CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. EVINS].

Mr. EVINS. Mr. Chairman, the perpetuation of monopoly should never be tolerated. It seems to me that the existing licensing and quota system perpetuates a monopoly for the big beef packers in the country and eliminates the possibility for a small packer or packers to enter the field. Completion is thus stifled, and a black market in meat will inevitably develop under such a system. In addition, by a scarcity of beef held off the market, the price to the consumer will thus go up. Let us have free competition, not a black market, and cheaper food prices for the consumers.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the debate thus far on this most important legislation has been too partisan. Too much interest shown for special groups. The combating of the evil of inflation should not be a partisan matter. It is a job for all of us to accomplish.

Frankly, the people of the great district which I have the honor to represent, being good Americans, do not like and do not want controls, but, being highly patriotic Americans, they recognize the need and necessity for some type of protection and some action in this regard during the continuance of this emergency to protect all Americans—protect our economy from the virus of inflation.

The people of my district feel that if controls are necessary and required—and such seems to be the case at this particular time—that they should be across the board, so to speak, and all along the line, fairly affecting all our people, all segments of the economy—industry, labor and commerce—alike and fairly.

No one wants controls—except on the other fellow. Manufacturers do not want controls to limit their profits. Labor does not want ceilings put on their wages and earning capacity. Our farmers and producers do not want a freeze on their efforts and productive capacity. No one segment of our economy and our people like controls for themselves or their group, yet each recognizes that some type of stabilization is necessary for the well-being of our country at this time.

I want to make my position clear—and that is that if we are to have controls they should be across the board—over-all and all along the line—fair to all and fairly administered. Otherwise, there should be none.

Our farmers do not like the freeze on raw cotton and our cattlemen do not like the roll-back on beef prices. They properly insist that it is unfair to permit prices of other products to go up while the products of the farm are held down and, in some instances, reduced.

There are no more patriotic citizens than our American farmers, and they are willing to make their share of the sacrifices so long as they are treated fairly and equally with the others and not discriminated against.

If the prices of farm products are to be held down the manufactured prod-

ucts which the farmers have to buy—farm machinery and such—should likewise be held down. If the prices of farm products are rolled back, then the prices of products produced by the manufacturers should be rolled back. Fairness and equity of sacrifice all along the line should be the order of this legislation.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, with the indulgence of the Committee, I should like to read a few brief statements taken from the extensive record of the testimony taken before the committee. These excerpts are from the testimony of men who have no special axes to grind, who represent no special interest groups, but men whose qualifications to speak on the subject are well known and whose testimony on this vital question should be listened to and heard with respect.

Mr. Bernard M. Baruch, whose qualification to speak on this matter is certainly recognized and whose views are sought, had this to say:

The existing law should be extended for at least a year. Our last, our best hope for averting another world war lies in getting stronger militarily without delay. We have hardly begun to rearm. We cannot strengthen our defenses as quickly as we must without effective control over the entire economy, so that our resources make the maximum contribution to the defense. The law should be strengthened by eliminating all favoritism and exemptions to any and all individuals and groups. * * * To stop inflation, action must be taken across the whole economy, over all prices, all wages, all rents, all costs.

Now, let me quote briefly from the testimony of Mr. Charles E. Wilson, Director of Defense Mobilization, and former president of General Electric—a businessman who is charged with the responsibility of administering this program.

The defense program has not yet had anywhere near the maximum impact on the economy. The greatest scarcities * * * are yet to come. Similarly, the greatest pressures on prices and wages—the most serious threat of inflation—will be felt some months from now. We have obligated for military procurement more than \$27,000,000,000 and by July 1, 1952, we shall have obligated an additional \$57,000,000,000. The inflationary pressures coming up are not psychological—they are very real—arising from the full impact of the production program. * * * Until our security has been assured, we cannot relax, we cannot slacken our efforts.

I also feel in this connection, Mr. Chairman that we would be advised to listen to what Mr. William McChesney Martin, Chairman of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, has told the committee—Mr. Martin, as we all know, being also qualified to speak on the subject of finances and national economy:

The full effects of expansion for defense purposes are still to be felt. * * * Federal expenditures for defense and related activities are scheduled to rise sharply and may account for as much as 20 percent of total output within a year. It would be extremely unfortunate if any of the means we have been using to stem the inflationary

tide should be allowed to lapse at this critical moment when they are achieving a considerable measure of success.

Further, Mr. Martin testified—and this seems to me important in view of statements made here yesterday that credit restriction and credit controls alone should be employed:

I think that we would still need to use all of the weapons in our arsenal to halt this inflationary tide. I think that the conventional, orthodox methods of credit control must be exercised, but they alone will not do the job in a quasi-war situation and a situation which changes from week to week and month to month and is, therefore, not predictable in any precise sense. * * * We have to use a variety of weapons across the board and no one of them alone will do the whole job.

Mr. Chairman, I fear that Russia has not altered her long-term plans, despite the cease-fire negotiations under way. We must continue to prepare our military arm and strengthen our economy. It is the consensus of many in a position to know that the greatest pressures on our economy from our present defense program are yet to come.

We should, therefore, not relax our effort following a truce in Korea, which we hope and pray may properly materialize.

Let me urge that we strengthen our country's military arm and that whatever program of controls which may be adopted during this emergency be a fair one—fairly administered—one which does not bring about inequities or discrimination.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. KEATING].

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, about the only thing I am sure of in connection with this particular amendment is that I can add nothing to the enlightenment of my colleagues by anything I might say about it. I do, however, for my own education on the subject want to address this question to the author of the amendment and likewise to someone like the gentleman from New York [Mr. MULLEN] who is strongly opposed to the amendment.

Is there any connection between the fixation of slaughtering quotas and the administration of the price-control program? I am anxious to avoid taking any action which can possibly have the effect of driving the price of meat to the consumer any higher than it is now. Perhaps this amendment has nothing to do with that question. It may relate solely to the elimination of black-market operators, also certainly a desirable objective, but as to which there is apparently considerable difference of opinion regarding the result of adopting the amendment. I recognize the gentleman from Kansas is opposed to the entire price-control program and I respect his views although I do not agree in all respects. Does the adoption or failure to adopt this amendment have anything to do with the administration of the price-control program?

Mr. HOPE. It is part of the administration of the price-control program.

Mr. KEATING. Is the fixation of quotas of assistance in the proper administration of a sound price-control program?

Mr. HOPE. That depends upon the viewpoint. Mr. DiSalle says it is. I think it is a detriment and a hindrance to the operation of such a program.

Mr. KEATING. In other words, the gentleman's view is that it hinders the program rather than helps it?

Mr. HOPE. Certainly.

(By unanimous consent, the time allotted to Mr. PATMAN and Mr. DEANE was given to Mr. SPENCE.)

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. McKINNON].

Mr. McKINNON. Mr. Chairman, most people should be in agreement that there are two things we want to do in relation to our situation on meat. We want to encourage maximum production, but on the other hand we want to get equitable distribution.

Now there is a fear about this quota which is totally unfounded. The OPS does not reach up into the blue and draw down a quota. The quota is based upon the movement of livestock to the market. The cattleman himself is the man who sets the quota. It works this way. Each month at the first of the month the Department of Agriculture estimates the cattle that are going to move to market in that given month. They adjust that estimate from time to time, every day or every few days or every week. If a lot of cattlemen move their stock into the market the quota goes up. If they do not move their stock into market the quota goes down. It is the cattleman himself who determines that quota. So we do not touch maximum production in this formulation of the quota, but what we do accomplish is to see that we have an equitable distribution. We have heard pleas by the slaughterhouses. If a slaughterhouse historically last year was butchering 10 cows and this year the same amount of cattle moves into market, he will be able to butcher the same 10 cows if we have this quota assignment. But if we do not have this quota assignment some larger outfit or some black marketeer can move in and take over the purchase and the established slaughterhouse will lose the quota that belongs to it. More than that, the community that is normally supplied by this slaughterhouse will be without meat.

This amendment should be voted down if maximum production and equitable distribution are to be obtained.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Montana [Mr. D'Ewart].

Mr. D'Ewart. Mr. Chairman, over the last 30 or more years I have marketed a few cattle each year. I have sold them as low as 3 cents a pound and have sold them as high as 43 cents a pound. This quota system is the most ridiculous thing I have ever run up against, and I marketed cattle under the OPA during the last war. Why in the

world, when there are more cattle in the country than there have been for years, and why in the world, when there are 5,000,000 more people in the United States than there were a year ago, we should limit the quota on cattle to 90 percent of the number sold last year, is beyond me to understand. It is the most ridiculous thing I have ever heard. We have these cattle. The number of people have increased. We would like to furnish this meat to the people. Yet the OPS says that we cannot market more than 90 percent during the month of July. I checked that figure before I came into the well of the House. I sincerely hope the amendment of the gentleman from Kansas will prevail and that there will be an end to quotas.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. D'Ewart. I yield.

Mr. BENDER. Here are about 1,500 of the several thousand telegrams which have been pouring into my office this afternoon. Obviously my constituents are somewhat concerned about this issue. You can appreciate why I am so concerned and confused when every few minutes the Western Union boys are running themselves bowlegged with messages from my constituents. All these telegrams are on this issue of controls. In fact, my office staff is now burning the midnight oil keeping up with what is happening here.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SPENCE] to close debate.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman to yield for the purpose of reading the following notation in regard to beef parity:

Back in 1948 and 1949, run-away beef prices were pushing up the price parity ratio—based on the 1910-14 relationship between prices received and prices paid—well up toward 175 percent. Monthly calculations of the beef parity ratios were getting so high as to be scandalous. The beef lobby was concerned. Congress changed the base period for beef parity to the average of the preceding 10 years. These 10 years preceding 1951 are the very lush and profitable years of 1941-50. It is with these fat years used as a base of 100 that the new parity ratio rose to 152. Calculated on the old base, beef prices in April of this year stood at 205.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to be an expert on the cattle industry. I think it is obvious that those who are opposed to the quota are opposed to any ceiling on beef. I hope I do not do any injustice to anybody in that respect. And it seems to me it is very obvious that all those who spoke against the quota were against a ceiling on beef.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield for a reply.

Mr. KEATING. No reply. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SPENCE. I do not yield for a question.

It is obvious that if you are going to have ceilings, and we admit that ceilings are obnoxious to people, but if you are going to have ceilings you must have some control. Quotas are the only means that I know of whereby you can control the slaughtering. If there is any other way of controlling it, I have not been informed of it. The regulation merely continues the historical pattern of beef slaughtering that is in existence now and that has continued for a long, long time.

Quotas are not looked upon as so unusual in this country. The tobacco growers vote quotas on themselves, because they feel it is for their benefit to have quotas.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield for a question.

Mr. HOPE. I am going to ask the question if the Director of Price Stabilization does not have authority and power to punish violations of price ceilings and can use that power against every packer and every wholesaler and every retailer who violates the quotas?

Mr. SPENCE. He can if he catches them, but he will not have any way of finding them out unless he has some control over them. The evils that come from black marketing are more than just the evils of raising the price. They are the same character evils that come from bootlegging liquor. They are the evils that come from a disregard of the law. They are not only bad for our economy but they are bad for the morality of the people of the United States. It is not only essential that we prevent black markets because of the rise in prices of beef, but it is essential that we prevent them because of the bad effect they have on the morals of the American people.

I admit that the gentleman from Kansas has made a deeper study of this question than I with reference to slaughtering, but I think I can see the obvious. The gentleman from Kansas, of course, represents a great beef-producing country. I have no objection to his representing his people in that respect; I think it is natural that he should look out for their interests; we all do that. But there is another problem here; it is not a city program and it is not a country problem; it is the problem of fighting inflation, and it is the problem of seeing that the men, women, and children of America have sufficient food at fair prices; that is the problem that presents itself.

I represent a district that is half agricultural and half industrial, and I often want some help from the agricultural part of my State. The agricultural districts often need help from the cities to obtain legislation that will do them justice and I am sure you will agree with me when I say the city members seldom fail. I know that the people of my cities voted for parity; they voted for many things that the agricultural people wanted. We cannot divide this country into sections with prejudices one against the other, because it weakens, it weakens

us economically, it weakens us morally, it weakens us spiritually. There is no fight here between the country and the city; the question is: What is best for all of our people? What is best in this time of emergency which we hope may be over before long? What is best for all our people? Farming is the basic industry. The farmer feeds the American people. He is entitled to all the credit in the world for that; he is a great citizen; he has helped our country in time of peace and in time of war. But I think now he must make a sacrifice. No man has a right to profit because of the condition our country is in. They talk about the power of the Government; why, the Government can take your boy away from you and put him out on the hills of Korea and make him give up his life if need be. Then they talk about property rights. Property rights are very insignificant as compared to the authority to take the boys of America to fight for our country and our institutions. The Government has the right to regulate the slaughterers, and if there is any other way to do it except putting your hand on them and holding the control there I do not know what it is.

I hear men say that we do not need any controls; we need a free market. I have heard the President appeal to the people to use self-restraint and to agree to do the things they ought to do. Only the good obey the admonition; only the good obey those who ask them to do the things that are right. The bad will profit. There must be some controls, and it seems to me the most efficient way to control this great industry—I want to do it justice, I want to see that they make a profit—the only way to do it is to put your hand on them and say: "You shall have what you have had in past years; you shall have what the historical pattern entitles you to."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SPENCE. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. The other body in their wisdom adopted this amendment by a vote of 75 to 10 with the support of the majority and minority leaders. Were they wrong?

Mr. SPENCE. What the other body has done does not influence me. I will tell you what it does; it takes away all discretion from the House. We can just abdicate our function and let the other body dictate what we should do. Do you think that desirable. If you pass this Hope amendment that ends it; it goes into the law and there is no way of taking it out. I hope the House and this committee will not do so.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. HOPE and Mr. PATMAN.

The Committee divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 200, noes 112.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SPENCE. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MILLS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3871) to amend the Defense Production Act of 1950, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

BUREAU OF CUSTOMS

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. O'TOOLE. Mr. Speaker, it is hoped the Senate will give serious consideration to the budget of the Bureau of Customs for the coming fiscal year. Crippling amendments to the Treasury appropriation bill, adopted by the House on March 21, would hamper enforcement activities of the Customs agency. The House Appropriations Committee voted to strike \$800,000 from Budget Bureau figures for Customs and then the House itself voted an additional cut of \$675,000. These cuts were voted at a time when the need was never greater for funds to combat smuggling activities in the war on narcotics. Cuts made by the House were incorporated in spur-of-the-moment amendments as part of a general economy move and were ill-considered and ill-advised in view of the very obvious need for more Customs inspectors to combat the drug traffic.

The fact is the Bureau of Customs has long been hobbled by lack of adequate funds to carry on the work assigned to it. As import trade has increased, limitations under which Customs staffs have been forced to work have become more acute. Meantime, Customs receipts have been running more than 50 percent higher than during the previous year.

Narcotics Chief Anslinger, writing on the problem of teen-age dope addicts in the United States News and World Report of June 29, 1951, in answer to the question, Can Congress Help? said:

We would like to increase our force. And, of course, the Customs Bureau should be given additional guards.

Under leave to extend my remarks, I include the following excerpts from the New York Daily Mirror, the New York Herald Tribune, and the New York Journal of Commerce, which lend emphasis to the urgent need to strengthen enforcement activities of the Customs Bureau.

From the Daily Mirror of June 20, 1951:

United States Customs inspectors are raising a loud voice in militant opposition to

the Government's "penny wise and pound foolish" attitude in slicing Customs appropriations almost a million and a half. Already operating with an anemic force, the customs men believe our first line of defense against narcotics smuggling and other contraband debauching may be even more dangerously weakened by additional cuts in force and operations.

In addition to providing Uncle Sam's wall of protection, the customs men more than pay for themselves. They have already added more than \$446,000,000 to the United States Treasury via revenue collections for the current fiscal year, and their intake may run far in excess of \$600,000,000.

From the Herald Tribune of June 20, 1951:

NARCOTICS TRAFFIC—PERIL TO CUSTOMS PROTECTION SEEN IN APPROPRIATION CUT

To the New York Herald Tribune:

A basic fact is that the Customs Service is the first and only line of defense against the entrance of narcotics into this country. Excellent enforcement work is being done by the Bureau of Narcotics, and the various municipal and State police departments. All of these agencies, however, go to work after the narcotics have entered the country from abroad. It is only the vigilance of the Customs Service which prevents this scourge from overrunning the entire country. Unfortunately, the Customs Service has a pitiful few to hold back this invasion. Our borders have been all but stripped and there is not a single port that is not undermanned.

On March 21 the House of Representatives voted to cut the customs appropriations by \$675,000. This was in the face of the unanimous recommendation of the subcommittee which had studied the bill for many weeks, and which had itself made a cut of \$800,000. If this total of \$1,475,000 is cut from the bill, the operations of the Customs Service will be severely handicapped. Customs is a revenue-producing agency. In addition to protecting the citizens of this country from contraband and narcotics, we collected nearly \$446,000,000 during the first 9 months of this fiscal year. It is estimated that for the full year the total will be in excess of \$600,000,000.

The curtailment of customs activities is a deadly serious matter. Economy in government is necessary and desirable. However, let us practice economy with reason by cutting where it is actually needed; not by opening wide the door to the dope smuggler's debauching traffic. We know that addiction, particularly among young people, has increased. We feel that this is so because the supply is plentiful, cheap and accessible. With the present personnel, customs is hamstrung in trying to do a complete enforcement job of stopping the dope before it enters the country. If the appropriation cut is allowed to stand, our association is of the opinion that the entire wall of customs protection will be dangerously weakened.

One of the facts established is that a principal source of revenue to the underworld is the narcotic traffic. We know that this traffic has been increasing. The smuggling of heroin, opium, morphine and marihuana has increased. The more we seize, the more attempts are made to smuggle dope in. It is frightening to know that, in many large cities, a "cap" of heroin can be bought as cheaply as marihuana.

JOHN J. MURPHY,
President, United States Customs
Inspectors' Association.
New York, June 17.

From the Import Bulletin published by the Journal of Commerce at New York:

We hope the Senate will show more sense than the House in the handling of the Customs Bureau's budget for the coming fiscal year. If it does not, importers can look forward to further vexations and costly delays at United States ports of entry.

The rub is not so much that the House Appropriations Committee voted to lop \$800,000 from President Truman's \$38,300,000, request for the Bureau, or even that the House itself then voted an additional cut of \$675,000. The total amount is not large, and a certain amount of judicious trimming is necessary wherever possible in the Government's nondefense budget.

But the trouble is that these cuts were voted at a time when the need is plainly for greater, not reduced, appropriations for the Customs Bureau. Moreover, they appear to have been made on the spur of the moment for reasons which were ill-considered if not actually foolish.

The Customs Bureau has long been hobbled by the lack of adequate funds to carry on the work assigned to it. This is a fact widely bemoaned in foreign-trade circles, and seemingly obvious to nearly everyone but Congress, the only body in a position to do anything about it.

As our import trade has increased, the limitations under which the port collectors are forced to work have become more and more painfully apparent. As far back as last September, customs clerks in the port of New York, who can normally be expected to process 50 entries a day, were struggling with an average of 103. Appraisers' stores were falling behind 200 to 600 cases a day, and approximately 43,000 uncompleted ledger statements were reported to have accumulated in the Divisions of Accounts and Entries. By the end of the year the backlog of unliquidated entries at this port stood at 274,000. Since then, by dint of hard work, the customs staff here is reported to have come abreast of the daily volume of entries. But its backlog has grown to 286,000. In the meantime, customs receipts have been running nearly 55 percent higher than during the previous fiscal year.

Why, then, has the House voted to cut the budget back to the level of the present fiscal year, which actually will buy \$500,000 less in man-hours because of salary increases in the Bureau?

Two chief reasons were given for this: one was that the Bureau had failed to hire 207 new employees it had been authorized to hire, the funds having been voted in January. The other was that the Bureau had failed to put into effect certain Treasury recommendations for streamlining procedure.

In the first instance, it appears that the 207 new workers were to have been taken on as of March 1, while the House check showing that none of them had been employed was made on February 8. Customs officials explain with some reason that they cannot find and process through civil-service channels all the right kind of employees all at once. Certainly they could have been given 3 months' grace.

Something of the same can be said of the second complaint—that Customs has not given sufficient attention to ways and means of improving its own performance. Actually, the Bureau has put several of the Treasury's recommendations into effect. Some others it still has under study. Still others it feels are impracticable and many would require enabling legislation.

But criticizing the Customs Bureau for failing to streamline its own machinery is like scolding a chauffeur for frequent breakdowns of a 1918 Stanley Steamer. What is needed, as we and many others have said

repeatedly, is a new machine, not a rubber-band and paper-clip patchwork job on the old one.

Congress has now had before it for 2 years a measure known as the Customs simplification bill which would provide the basis for the type of streamlined structure our Customs Bureau should be. This measure has the support of the major foreign trade organizations and of the Customs Bureau itself. But it has run into one snarl after another, and today seems no nearer passage than at this time a year ago.

It is much to be hoped that the responsible legislators will take a long hard look at the record of their own failure to take the first necessary step toward an efficient, up-to-date customs system. But so long as they seek to dodge the responsibility of providing an efficient machine, the least that can be expected of them is that they will provide the chauffeur with sufficient funds to keep the old one running.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. BECKWORTH asked and was given permission to address the House for 10 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to vacate her special order for today and to address the House for 5 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BECKWORTH] is recognized for 10 minutes.

COTTON ACREAGE

Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Speaker, when the cotton-quota legislation was considered last year I had a good deal to say about what I conceived to be the final effects of that legislation so far as the distribution of income from cotton is concerned. Some people do not seem to be aware of the fact that when you limit acreage you limit bales and therefore you limit dollars. In effect, finally, it amounts to a method of distribution of dollars derived from the sale of cotton.

I pointed out at that time that in many instances where one county in a given State got 15 times as many acres as another county that did not represent the fact merely that that county's income from cotton was 15 times the income of the other county. I pointed out that in many instances the final figures translated into dollars would be much more. I have been able to collect some facts and figures from the Department of Agriculture. In one State, for example, and this is no isolated instance by any means, one county received some 2,600 allotments of cotton and another county in the same State received some 2,600 allotments of cotton.

The final income from cotton in one of the counties was under \$400,000 whereas the final income from cotton in the other county was \$27,000,000, just about 80 times as much. I questioned the justice of such a program at that time, and I question it even more vigorously today after seeing the figures. I say to the membership of the House as Emerson said, "Every excess brings on a defect, and every defect finally an excess."

We have some excesses and some defects in our farm program today. Finally everybody loses as a result of that sort of thing. As one who was born and reared on the farm, I recognize how important agriculture is to the people of this country. I yield to no one in my friendship for agriculture and our farmers. Many of my relatives earn their livings from agriculture and raising cattle today. But we must have fair and equitable programs. I have said this before to the membership of the House that when aid is sought in the Congress it is sought in the name of the farmer, but when the giving out takes place, too small a segment gets away with a too heavy percentage of the sum total of aid. Yes, we must undertake as the programs continue, to bring about more fairness and more justice and more equity and I ask and hope that the membership of the House will read carefully this very comprehensive study which has been prepared in regard to the distribution finally and actually of the income from cotton.

Mr. DORN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. DORN. I was not in the last Congress, but I have read the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and I know of the fight that the gentleman made in behalf of the small cotton farmers of Texas and of the South generally. We all appreciate what the gentleman did when he was making his fight for the cotton farmers. My father-in-law had to plow up cotton. But this year a committee called on him and begged him to plant more cotton. I think the farmers of this country have common sense enough to know that we should raise cotton and there should not be such a great difference in the program from 1 year to another.

Somewhere along the line something is lacking. We appreciate what the gentleman has done and appreciate the efforts he is now putting forth in behalf of the cotton farmer.

Mr. BECKWORTH. They cut some of my people down to less than an acre. Some who had farmed and wish to farm could get no acreage. Some people who grew little more than one bale of cotton are compelled to pay heavy penalties to sell the cotton. This, I feel, is unwarranted.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

Mr. HARRIS. I concur in what the gentleman has said, and compliment him highly on the fight he has made over a long period of time on this important matter. I also want to remind the gentleman that he supported an amendment which I offered during the consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill for the measurement of cotton acreage in 1951, notwithstanding that we do not have cotton quotas. Is it not a fact that part of this dilemma came out of 1946, 1947, and 1948 when we did not have any records whatsoever and now looking forward to another year, since the policy program is still in effect and is still a matter of law, we are probably

going to have another such dilemma in the future if we do not have a measurement of acreage of 1951?

This morning I went before the Senate Committee on Appropriations on that particular matter. I welcome the gentleman's comment and the efforts he has made with reference to this program.

Mr. BECKWORTH. The gentleman has been a great deal of help on this problem. He was the author of an amendment which the House was considerate enough to adopt that should have the effect of helping bring about more order when we do have another allotment program. Judging from the very report that appeared in the paper this morning, in the writings of Mr. John Ball, of the Washington Post, it certainly looks like we are going to have quotas in the foreseeable future because he predicts the production of cotton may be probably 16,000,000 or 17,000,000 bales.

I am glad to see the Secretary of Agriculture recognizes this problem—the problem of the family-size farmer. He recently wrote me a letter in regard to the family-size farmer, and he welcomed from me, he stated, any observations that might be presented that would make strong the family-size farmer. I told him, among other things, through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD that one of the best things to do, when you invite people to grow a crop, particularly the small farmer, is to give them at least some acreage. That was not done in many instances. If they are given any acreage, give them enough to justify their growing a crop.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include certain data in connection with this subject.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. BECKWORTH. It should be borne in mind many people asked for allotments in 1950 who could not get them because they were classified as new farmers. A new farmer might be and often was one who had farmed many years, but because in 1950 he was not on a piece of land that had cotton on it in 1946, 1947, or 1948, he was legislated out of the cotton business by being called a new farmer.

It should be emphasized that many of the counties which received the least number of acres, had the least production, and the least number of dollars per allotment likewise had numerous tenant farmers. Thousands of these especially in the poor land counties received no cotton acreage or so little they could not afford to plant cotton.

When acres are limited, bales of cotton are limited, hence dollars are limited. Allotment of acres means ultimately allotment of dollars. The spread of "average dollars per allotment" as between the given counties in a given State is remarkable.

For example, each man receiving a cotton allotment in one Texas county sold an average of \$10,671.34 worth of cotton—a total of \$27,798,840—whereas each man in another Texas county sold an average of \$124.30—a total of \$334,980—worth of cotton which means the allotment in one Texas county is worth in

dollars more than 80 times what the allotment in another Texas county is worth. I seriously question the justness of such a situation. The former county—the one with the larger income—had 2,605 people receiving allotments whereas the latter county—the one with the smaller income—had 2,695 allotments. The latter county I might add has been growing cotton doubtless 100 years. The total income of the larger county is approximately 80 times the latter county, although the acreage allotted to the more fortunate county has only 14 times what the acreage in the less fortunate county was.

Farmers are told to grow truck crops and cattle when they cannot get cotton and peanut allotments, as is shown in the following letters:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,

Quitman, Tex., May 29, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
New House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in reference to your letter, dated May 13, 1950, to the Wood County PMA Committee.

We have approximately 400 peanut producers in the county. The least number of acres each producer can afford to grow is 2 acres. We have about 150 producers who received allotments of less than 2 acres. Of those growers having allotments of less than 2 acres, there will be about 25 or 50 who will cease to grow peanuts. I do not believe there will be any to cease to farm for themselves. The number of new producers were 35 and the number of acres distributed was 21.4 acres and the average to each was 0.6 of an acre.

The excess acreage (for oil) up to the 1947 picked and threshed will help at least 150 to 200 producers in Wood County. (I am told today, June 5, 1950, by Mr. Akers, that peanuts for edible purposes are worth \$200 to \$220 a ton and for oil purposes from \$100 to \$120 a ton.) [Part added in parentheses by LINDLEY BECKWORTH.]

Hoping the above is the desired information, I am

Yours very truly,

ROY E. BARNETT,
Secretary, Wood County PMA Committee.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,

Quitman, Tex., April 10, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN: This is in reference to your letter of April 5, 1950, to the county committee.

(1) The number of farmers receiving 5 acres of cotton or less was 1,248. (2) The number of new producers that applied for allotments was 340. (3) The acreage that was available to distribute among the new producers was 300. (4) Each producer received from 1 acre to 1.1 acres. (5) The number of zero allotments was 10. (6) The percent of new producers regarded as genuine farmers was 83 percent (300) applications.

The number of applications left from item 2, less item 5, less item 6, consisted of 30 applications that did not meet the necessary eligibility requirements.

If you desire further information please advise.

Yours very truly,

ROY E. BARNETT,
Secretary of Wood County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,

De Ridder, La., May 22, 1950.

Mr. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Congress of the United States,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BECKWORTH: In reference to your letter of May 18, 1950, listed below is a tabulation to your questionnaire. Thank you for your interest in peanut and cotton farmers.

Very truly yours,

T. SHELBY OAKES,
Administrative Officer, Beauregard
Parish Production and Marketing
Administration.

Peanuts, 1950

Number of peanut producers.....	67
Number of peanut acres he can economically grow.....	5
Number of producers received allotment less than 5 acres.....	60
Number of producers received allotment less than 2 acres.....	47
Number of producers received less than 2 acres that will cease to grow peanuts.....	25
Number of producers that will cease to farm for themselves.....	--
Number of new producers applied for allotment in 1950.....	3
How many acres did you have to distribute.....	5.9
Approximately how much did they receive (all 3).....	5.9

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,

De Ridder, La., June 1, 1950.

DEAR SIR: Please find enclosure for your attention.

Yours very truly,

T. SHELBY OAKES,
Parish Administrative Officer,
County Committee of Beauregard Parish.

Cotton, 1950

1. Cotton producers in Beauregard Parish.....	307
2. Farmers receiving 5 acres or less of cotton.....	272
3. New producers applied for acreage.....	150
4. Acreage to distribute among new producers.....	415
5. Acreage each received.....	2.0-3.4
6. Farmers receiving zero acreage.....	13
7. Percent of new producers regarded as genuine farmers.....	90
8. a. Acreage the new cotton amendment helped new producers.....	0
b. Old ones.....	0
9. Number of producers receiving less than 5 acres that will probably grow no cotton.....	15
10. Number of farmers that will cease to farm for themselves.....	-----

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,

Canton, Tex., March 20, 1950.

O. L. HAPTONSTALL,
Fruitvale, Tex.

DEAR SIR: This is to advise that the county committee finds it necessary to set up a zero allotment on the above farm serial number. Since we had 600 applications for new grower allotments and only 427.7 acres of cotton, you can see that the average allotment would have been 0.7 of an acre if all approved for allotments. The county committee approved 257 farms for new grower allotment with an average allotment of 1.7 acres. In view of the above facts we cannot see that you have been done any disservice by disapproval of your application.

Any appeal from the above must be made within 15 days from the date of this notice.

Your application was disapproved for one of the reasons set out below.

1. Work stock and equipment not available.
2. Has a cotton allotment on another farm.
3. Cotton allotment not necessary to livelihood of operator.
4. Land not adapted to production of cotton.
5. Allotment which could be set up too small to be of possible benefit to farm operator.

R. W. BROWN,
N. L. CHEATHAM,
J. M. STEPHENS,

County Committee, Van Zandt County
PMA.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
Gilmer, Tex., November 17, 1950.

To: Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH.
From: Lewis E. Stracener, Jr., administrative officer, Upshur County PMA.
Subject: Reply to letter written to Mr. B. F. Vance, chairman State PMA committee in regard to complaint of Mr. Howard M. (Reece) Smith, route 1, Big Sandy, Tex., having difficulty with his cotton allotment.

Mr. Smith is operating a farm this year that did not have any cotton or war crop history for the years used in setting up cotton acreage allotment. Therefore, under the regulations this farm was considered a new farm for cotton allotment.

Mr. Smith filed an application for a new grower cotton allotment and received 4.2 acres cotton allotment out of the reserve set up for new growers. Mr. Smith planted 3.7 acres of cotton on farm.

I rather think Mr. Smith is complaining about 1950 peanut allotment. The farm Mr. Smith is operating has no 1950 peanut acreage allotment as farm has no past peanut history and he has 12.8 acres of peanuts planted on farm and intends to thresh and sell the peanuts which will be subject to the 5.4 cent penalty per pound, according to peanut marketing quota regulations.

Mr. Smith signed application for a new grower peanut allotment. County committee recommended a 5-acre peanut allotment when application was submitted to State PMA committee for approval. After review by State committee, a zero allotment was approved by State committee. However, the new grower peanut allotments amounted to nothing, since no new grower applicant received more than 0.6 acre, mostly 0.2 to 0.4 acre allotment.

LEWIS E. STRACENER, JR.,
Administrative Officer, Upshur County PMA.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
Carthage, Tex., December 29, 1949.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will acknowledge your letter of December 19, 1949, requesting certain data relative to cotton allotments in Panola County, Tex.

In comparing 1950 with 1942 allotments we note that Panola had an allotment of approximately 52,700 acres in 1942 and 17,367 for 1950. These figures include the allotment for new growers also.

You ask about release and reapportionment of unused cotton acreage allotment. We expect very few acres from this source. We estimate 150 for the county. Farmers anticipate changes in procedures and fear

that the surrender of cotton allotment may affect any future allotment that would be established on the farm.

We are in bad shape on new grower farms (those who did not grow cotton in any of the years 1946, 1947, or 1948); 1,300 such farms, and only 1,000 acres to distribute. Of this 1,300, at least 400 will apply for a portion of this acreage.

I hesitate to estimate the number of tenants that will be without homes as a result of the small allotments in this county. The big move will start in the spring and after Congress has considered giving some relief. They still have hopes that something better will come their way. No doubt the gentleman from Wills Point, Tex., was about right in his estimates. For example, in Panola County, in 1942, 0.3145 percent of the cropland was allowed for cotton, while in 1950 only 0.1398 percent is allowed.

We appreciate your interest and will gladly furnish any additional information upon request.

With kindest regards, I am,
Yours very truly,

T. L. VINCENT,
Administrative Officer, PMA, Panola
County, Tex.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
Athens, Tex., January 18, 1950.
MR. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: Henderson County reserved 1,450 acres of its official county allotment, all but 334 acres were used in adjusting 5- to 15-acre and other farms.

The chief concern of the committee is new-grower allotments as you see we only have 334 acres for this purpose, which will only be a drop in the bucket when distributed among 1,000 new growers.

We think you could relieve the situation in east Texas if you could get a price support on dry black-eyed and cream peas. Understand the State of California has one on black-eyed beans, which is the same as our peas.

The county committee concurs with Houston County in that the amendment will not help this county if we have to use the BAE acreage for the country. I am enclosing copy of a letter we sent TOM PICKETT.

If we can be of further help, please advise.
Yours sincerely,

RAYMOND G. MAGERS,
Chairman, PMA Committee of Hen-
derson County.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
Tyler, Tex., January 3, 1950.
MR. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: In reply to your letter of a few days ago, in which you requested information relative to the cotton allotment situation in Smith County, the following is submitted:

1. 1942 Smith County cotton allotment: 58,000 acres.

2. Number of acres we would have to redistribute if the unused 1950 allotment could be used. It is estimated that about 1,000 acres would be released by farmers for redistribution.

3. Number of acres that would come from genuine cotton farmers who cannot continue to farm because of too little acreage. It is doubtful if any acres would be released by

such farmers, as they would merely reduce the number of tenants on the farm, so that a reasonable crop could be had by each tenant.

4. War crop credit: Smith County would receive about 3,000 additional acres if this credit were granted.

5. Number of genuine cotton farmers that will be forced to quit farming in Smith County due to the 1950 cotton-allotment formula (including tenants). It is estimated that at least 500 will be forced off of farms due to insufficient cotton acreage.

Hoping this to be the desired information, and should additional information be needed don't fail to call on us.

For the county committee:

DAN G. OWEN,
Secretary, Smith County PMA.

They grow tomatoes, but then are told the following:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., June 25, 1951.
MRS. ROY DENTON,
Troup, Tex.

DEAR MRS. DENTON: Your letter of June 19 to the Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH, Congressman, Third District of Texas, has been referred to me.

I regret very much that we have no price support on fresh tomatoes. We fully understand that the price is very low and that farmers are not realizing the cost of production from the crop. I certainly hope that the market improves and that the producers will receive a fair return for the crop.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,
Chairman, State PMA Committee.
(Copy to LINDLEY BECKWORTH, Congress-
man.)

Note the article from the Kilgore Herald of June 17, 1951:

EAST TEXAS TOMATO GROWERS DENIED AID

WASHINGTON.—East Texas tomato farmers, faced with a bumper crop and low prices, aren't in line for such help because they overplanted, the Agriculture Department says.

Under Secretary C. J. McCormick in a letter to Senator CONNALLY (Democrat, Texas), said Texas growers, spurred by high prices in 1950, went against the Department's suggestions as to the acreage to be planted in tomatoes this year.

McCormick continued that laws governing purchases of surplus commodities require the Department consider whether farmers complied with suggested acreage limits.

"Therefore," he continued, "it has been our policy to deny assistance to vegetable growers in those areas substantially exceeding the Department's suggested acreage."

"The east Texas tomato producing area substantially exceeded our acreage suggestions."

He said the east Texas tomato acreage this year was 25 percent above 1950, and the estimated yield was 47 percent greater.

Another reason for the depressed market prices and slow movement of the crop in east Texas, McCormick explained, was the lateness of tomatoes maturing this year in the Rio Grande Valley. Freezes there caused a second planting, and a resulting overlapping in tomato crops from the two primary producing sections of Texas.

He added, however, that shipments from the Rio Grande Valley are declining and most of the remainder of the crop there will go to the canning factories. As a result, he said, "with less competition from other areas and improved quality of their own product, growers in east Texas should soon experience a more favorable market."

The farmers grow sweetpotatoes, but the following develops:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,

College Station, Tex., November 7, 1950.
HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,
Gladewater, Tex.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: You will find enclosed copy of final report of sweetpotato program RMP-25a-74 which was terminated November 3. You will note that only 500 bushels of potatoes were purchased.

I am also enclosing a copy of a letter to Mr. J. L. Harris, route 1, Gladewater, Tex., and one to Mr. N. E. Dudley, of Whitehouse, Smith County Tex., giving them information we have regarding shipments of sweetpotatoes from quarantined areas.

I want you to know that I appreciated the visit with you, and it is regretted that we were not able to help the farmers in your area. In summing up the potato situation up there this year and with the interest of the farmer at heart, you cannot blame the farmer for not selling his potatoes to the Government at a price we offered as most of the farmers were only getting 25 to 40 percent U. S. No. 1 potatoes off of their land and the actual cost to them runs at least \$75.00 per acre and the farmers felt that they had rather hold, taking a chance on a better market instead of taking a \$25.00 per acre loss on their potatoes.

The market is stronger and has improved some. I think the cooperative advertising has helped some. Assuring you of our cooperation, and with kindest personal regards, I am,

Yours very truly,

DENNIS M. POE,
Purchase Representative.

The farmers are told to grow cattle, but then comes the roll-back. Note these letters:

PITTSBURG, TEX., May 5, 1951.
The Honorable LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
The House of Representatives,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: After reading the attached article in the Wichita Daily Times, April 29, 1951, Wichita Falls, Tex., I have learned that it is the intention of the Office of Price Stabilization to roll back the price of beef received by the producers 18 percent by October 1951.

I am not a cattle king, and it is not my intent to become a cattle baron, but I am one of the many small producers of beef cattle who would like to have a decent return on the money and time I have invested in this enterprise.

To go further into detail, I will give you the following facts relative to my operation:

I have 108 acres in Camp and Upshire Counties and I use 211 acres in Franklin County, ownership being in the family. These two farms are ordinary east Texas farms and I judge worth \$11,000. The two farms are stocked with 48 cows and 2 bulls. These cows are common cows, most of them of Hereford type, with an occasional Angus, Shorthorn, or brindle cow. My bulls are Hereford and from considerably better stock than the cows. These cows are worth a minimum of \$10,000.

As you well know, from your past experience, a certain amount of costly equipment is necessary in order for an organization of this type to function. These items will include a pick-up truck, wire stretchers, lariet ropes, all sorts of hand tools and shovels, etc. I believe that allowing \$2,000 for this expense is not excessive. In addition, \$1,000 is needed to take care of any overhead.

The annual calf crop to be expected will run about 80 percent, therefore I expect to sell around 40 calves annually from my 48 cows at April 25, 1951, prices. These calves when sold at 9 or 10 months of age would average about \$100 each, or \$4,000.

Expenses during the year for feed, automobile expenses, and maintenance of fences and buildings alone will certainly amount to \$1,000 each year, leaving a net expected return of \$3,000.

If we, the producers, are cut back 18 percent as proposed by OPS, then my income will be reduced 18 percent of \$4,000, which is \$720. This amount deducted from my net income of \$3,000 will leave only \$2,280.

I believe and I think that you will agree that a return of \$2,280 for 1 year's work and a \$24,000 investment is entirely too little under current conditions. I also believe that this proposed OPS roll-back is unjustified and is discriminatory against the producer of beef cattle, when other expenses are not rolled back proportionately.

Any assistance or information you may be able to give will certainly be appreciated.

Respectfully yours,

W. REX SPENCER.

PITTSBURG, TEX., April 2, 1951.
LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

DEAR SIR: I am a small farmer with a few cattle, with high-priced feed and higher wages would make an awful hard go, with cattle prices cut back.

Our cattle have been raised on high-priced feed. If the cut-back comes, I don't see anything to do except quit producing cattle.

I hope we can get some relief and am asking you to do what you can to help us cattle growers.

Very respectfully,

H. M. MELTON.

EUSTACE, TEX., April 30, 1951.
To Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Washington, D. C.

Well, LINDY, here I come for some information from you. Now I am asking you. Well, they wrote me and said I owed them \$108.50 for growing a bale of cotton in 1950 because I did not sign a contract. My allotment is 3.6 acres. Say, I can't live on that small acreage. My peanuts acreage is 2.6 acres. I did not violate God's law growing one bale, as bad as we need it. My tax is so high I can't pay them everything, so high everybody left the farm and went to town to work. I am asking you, do I have to pay that \$108.50, or must I ignore it? So give me your opinion on it and answer at once. If I do have to pay for it, I am quitting farming to go to town to work. I can make a better living in town. I am growing peanuts for feed for my cattle. I did not ask the Government for help, and, if I can't grow what I want to on my farm enough to keep it up, there is no need staying on it. So the farmer is so handicapped he can't grow enough, anyhow.

So this year they want me to grow all the cotton I can. Trying to fine me for growing one bale in 1950, now what must I do—pay or not?

Now, here is the situation: Now I have 320 acres; my neighbor has 100 acres. He has 37 acres peanut allotment, I have 1 acre. So I am keeping a copy of this letter I am sending you. So tell me, do I have to pay or not? You find out and let me hear from you. I have been your supporter and Truman, too, so, I am trying to support the Government every way I can. My desire is grow something but the — does not want me to sell it, but by being penalized for it. If you can read this—I am left-handed—so answer as soon as you well can.

T. C. MEWBORNE.

MINNEOLA, TEX., May 1, 1951.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives,
Third Congressional District,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR LINDLEY: I have decided to write you concerning a problem that concerns not only you and I but our whole Nation.

It is the absentee ownership of land as I have seen it and read about in the State of Texas. I am sure you must have given no little thought to the matter as the decline of population in your district I feel is a definite outgrowth of this evil.

Many reasons for that decline is given by one and another authority but in my opinion the fact that good farms and ranches being as nearly unobtainable as they have become since so many business and professional people and people of means have developed the fad of buying farms as a hobby, or else for speculation purposes.

... own about 12,000 acres of land composed completely of small farms purchased and assembled into a block operated by one or two hired hands on each three or four thousand acres of land which formerly furnished a living for some 40 to 60 people or rather families.

... are just examples; there are numbers more owning hundreds of acres acquired in the same manner, and with hardly an exception these are people that acquired their money in some other manner than farming.

Add to these people the lower-income professional people who buy one or two small farms each and the many farms our old folks are living on and not operating and not able to rent or sell under the present administration of our old-age pension law, and you will see the difficulties faced by a person of moderate means who likes to farm or grow stock and also the reason our population is declining in our rural areas.

Also the ill will toward our Government created by these conditions is of no small import, since, as I am certain you are aware, the ownership of the majority of land by a few large landowners has always been a matter of disturbance in whatever country it has and is occurring.

This is a State-wide—and probably a Nation-wide—problem, as you can readily see by checking the sharp fall in the number of individually owned farms in the State of Texas during the last decade.

Being a man of limited education and experience in such matters, I can recommend no pat solution but do feel that through taxes or other means this situation should be remedied for the good of our Nation and its people and especially the future generations.

I am a disabled ex-marine—World War II—sent to the farm by the doctors to find a means of livelihood more suited to my health, and after 2 years of renting while trying to find a farm to buy have been made well aware of the situation in east Texas, and I hope you will find this whole problem worthy of your attention and consideration.

Sincerely,

BARTON S. HILL.

WILLS POINT, TEX., April 29, 1951.
MR. LINDLEY BECKWORTH.

DEAR LINDLEY: I have been intending to write you for some time in regards to some of the things that are being passed and put on farmers and stock raisers.

First, Disalle set the ceiling price on cotton at 45 cents, and just across the Mexican border cotton is selling for 85 cents a pound.

I sit here with a Dallas newspaper's headlines on beef prices—to be cut back 10 cents a pound. Still Brannan is asking for 16,000 bales of cotton. This is, as you know,

around Wills Point, a cotton and cattle country. Our son, D. L., Jr., and I, are farming 550 acres of land, and farm machinery is up this year about 25 percent above last year. Gasoline is up 2 cents a gallon, but DiSalle, Wilson, and Brannan are doing nothing about it. Fire the hell out of all.

LINDLEY, we think you are tops, but for God sakes, what is wrong up there. Guess by now you will say just another old foggy fool. I was at the cotton meeting in the bank. In regards to cotton allotments last year, Mr. Curtis asked me to state my allotment and acreage, which I did and I do want to tell you. I, my wife, and son did appreciate what you did in getting the cotton allotment raised.

LINDLEY, in 1949 D. L., Jr., and I ginned 74 bales of cotton; in 1950 we ginned 37 bales, 14,000 pounds of vetch, 600 bushels of corn. After expenses were paid we did not pay income tax, for expenses got it all. Still the farmer makes it all.

Your friend,

DAVE FULLER.

One then can easily understand why the Department of Agriculture is studying family-farm problems. Note Mr. McCormick's letter:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., June 27, 1951.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: During recent months it has become abundantly clear that our United States pattern of land tenure and family farming should be used as an American export of hope in our world-wide struggle against Communist expansion. But if democracy is to be a continuing source of hope to rural people elsewhere in the world, democracy must continue to advance in our own rural areas—we must hold the mirror up to ourselves. Secretary Brannan and I feel strongly the need for all farm organizations and public institutions concerned with agriculture to unite in a definite, vigorous program to strengthen family farming in America.

The purpose of this letter is to inform you of the steps we are taking in that direction.

With the aid of representatives from farm and church organizations and the land-grant colleges, we have initiated a Nationwide study of the Department's policies and programs with a view to determining (1) programs already well adapted to the need of family farmers, including the making of their greatest contribution to defense production at a minimum of cost for the services rendered; (2) programs which should be discontinued; and (3) programs and policies which should be changed to adapt them to family farm needs in the mobilization period.

As the first step in this review, at the request of the Secretary there has been created a family farm policy review committee made up of agricultural leaders from outside the Department as well as Department people. We invited each of the major farm and church organizations to designate representatives to participate in this committee. Under the committee's supervision, task groups were assigned to make preliminary reviews of programs and policies of each agency, which have now been consolidated into a provisional report and tentative recommendations to be used as a basis for the most widespread study and discussion we can obtain.

Copies of the provisional report are being made available in every county in the United States, with the assistance of farm and church groups requested in obtaining its widespread consideration through neighborhood meetings and discussion groups.

We have asked our State and county agricultural mobilization committees to act as

clearinghouses for getting reports and recommendations from farmers and farm groups during the next few months, but have also invited farm and church groups to consider and make recommendations on the policy review in any way they see fit.

I am enclosing for your information a copy of the provisional report, a copy of a pamphlet entitled "The Family Farm's Future" that explains our purpose in this review, together with a copy of the agricultural mobilization memorandum setting forth procedures for carrying out the policy review at the State and county levels.

I want to emphasize that the report is intended merely as a starting point for the widest possible consideration and discussion by farmers and farm groups throughout the Nation. From such discussion we hope to evolve final recommendations reflecting the broadest possible cross section of the opinions and ideas of American farmers themselves.

We believe such an appraisal will make a valuable and constructive contribution to the future guidance of the Department, and to the eventual formulation of improved national policies for the well-being of American agriculture.

Both the Secretary and I will welcome any suggestions you may care to make toward furtherance of such objectives.

Sincerely yours,

C. J. MCCORMICK,
Under Secretary.

In answering the Secretary's letter asking for suggestions about keeping strong our family-size farm units, I suggested to him through the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on page A3990, of the Appendix, the following. I might add I shall welcome his comments.

Mr. Speaker, among other things I hope to write the Secretary later, I would say to the Secretary and Mr. McCormick that many of these farmers referred to are not new farmers. Also I say to them when there are allotments, give these small farmers enough acreage to justify growing the given crops as I proposed August 3, 1949, on pages 10723 and 10728, volume 95, part 8, of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

"Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

"The Clerk read as follows:

"Amendment offered by Mr. BECKWORTH: Page 16, line 3, after the period insert the following subsection:

"(f) The penalty provided for in this section shall not apply with respect to cotton produced by any person who is recognized by the county committee as being a cotton farmer if his total acreage does not exceed 5 acres."

"Mr. BECKWORTH. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

"Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask some of the Members who are sponsoring this bill this question. It is in the form of an assumption, but I think a very real assumption.

"Assume that a veteran 25 or 26 years of age never did anything except grow cotton on a cotton farm until 1942 when he went into the Army; assume he remained in the Army until 1946; assume that he took GI training to be a mechanic, for 2 years, and while doing so he did not farm; assume that he owns a 60-acre cotton farm which has had no cotton on it since 1942; assume that today he loses his job and goes back to that cotton farm which has not had cotton grown on it since 1942. The question is: Will he be privileged to get 5 acres of cotton?

"Mr. PACE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

"Mr. BECKWORTH. I yield.

"Mr. PACE. That depends, and I have tried to explain it to the gentleman, that depends entirely upon the State PMA Committee of the State of Texas, and the county PMA

committee in which that farm is located. He can, and will very likely get considerably more than 5 acres. It depends upon the amount of acreage the State committee allocates to that county for new farms. If the State committee gives the county, for example, 500 acres for new farms every acre of it must go to new farms. Then, in addition to that 500 acres, the county committee may reserve 10 percent that can be used for new farms. So the allotment could be identical with like farms in the same area.

"Mr. BECKWORTH. May I ask this further question: However, is it true or it is not true that the definite 5-acre minimum applies to him?

"Mr. PACE. It does not."

Mr. Speaker, apparently others feel the same way.

"[From the Farmer-Stockman of November 1950]

"TALKS WITH OUR READERS

"(By Ferdie J. Deering, editor)

"The futility of Government attempts to control crop production through acreage allotments is demonstrated again in the 1950 cotton-crop failure. So, for 1951 at least, there won't be any acreage controls on the cotton crop.

"The breakdown of the allotment system might be glossed over by designating last spring's 'cotton surplus' as 'national reserve this fall. But that won't keep farmers from regarding last spring's red tape in the form of red ink this fall. What does it matter if cotton sells for 40 cents a pound if you lost your crop to bugs, bad weather, and bureaucrats?

"Farmers planted only about 18,000,000 of the 21,000,000 acres allotted this year, in spite of clamor for larger allotments in some areas. Texas in 1949 grew about one-third of the Nation's cotton, so drew a big cut in acreage this year. But farmers planted 8 percent less than allotted. Oklahoma, with a small allotment failed by about 19 percent to get it all planted.

"A survey by Texas Congressman LINDLEY BECKWORTH revealed that one reason was that, all over the Cotton Belt, thousands of farmers received less than 5 acres cotton-acreage allotment. Many of these planted no cotton.

"In Oklahoma, 384 of Le Flore County's 2,097 cotton growers had less than 5 acres. In Stephens County 305 had 5 acres or less. In Atoka County 659 growers were assigned less than 5 acres. In Carter County, where Ardmore was once a major inland cotton market, 154 of the 735 old cotton growers had under 5 acres. The list could be extended in Texas, Tennessee, Arkansas, or Mississippi."

"COUNTRY GENTLEMAN,

Philadelphia, March 1, 1951.

"HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

"DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BECKWORTH: Thank you for letting us see the page from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD telling of Mr. Spivey's experience with the PMA. There ought to be an exemption of 5 acres, to take care of the little farmers, in any future allotment programs.

"Sincerely yours,

"E. H. TAYLOR."

"SOUTHWESTERN CROP AND STOCK,

Lubbock, Tex., March 10, 1951.

"HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,

House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

"DEAR REPRESENTATIVE BECKWORTH: The H. R. Spivey case is perhaps only one of hundreds so affected. It bespeaks an unjust situation. Your proposal of a 5-acre exemption is favorable. My opinion is that it should be considered a bare minimum exemption in any future allotment programs.

"We appreciate your sending us the page from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and asking our opinion in the matter.

"Yours very truly,

"RAYMOND LEE JOHNS,
Publisher."

Among other suggestions I, in this manner, submit to the Secretary of Agriculture this one: Make a similar study to the one I herewith include concerning cotton for all crops subject to or likely to become subject to controls.

Also I suggest to the Secretary that he diligently seek to get accurate figures for his Washington office as to where the Federal money is going in the cases where given crops are being supported in any manner. If this is done, in my opinion, a wiser use of the Federal dollar for price support of crops will take place. I refer specifically to the five pages of communications which I placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, June 30, 1951.

Also I suggest that no effort be made to prevent information being obtained as to allotments. I judge this type of instruction was sent to many counties:

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
Gainesville, Fla., May 9, 1950.

SPECIAL LETTER TO COTTON COUNTIES

To: PMA secretaries, administrative officers, and chief clerks in cotton counties.

From: R. S. Dennis, executive officer.

Subject: Inquiry from Congressman BECKWORTH.

We have just received the following telegram from Mr. Frank K. Woolley, Deputy Administrator, PMA:

"Instruct county offices to delay until further advised replying to Congressman BECKWORTH's letter to counties asking 11 questions with respect to cotton under Public Law 471."

Please comply with the instructions from the Deputy Administrator in this connection.

ASH FLAT, ARK., May 10, 1950.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Washington, D. C.:

In regard to information requested by the county PMA office, we were ready to mail reply when orders came not to reply until otherwise notified.

As I am on the county committee, I am also writing to try to find out where the orders to withhold came from and what authority they had to issue the order to withhold anything from anyone, as all records should be open to the public at any time.

I hope to be able to furnish the information soon.

Very truly yours,

ROBY SOUTHARD.

My good friend, Mr. Vance, says he feels we should have as many family size farms as possible.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
College Station, Tex., June 21, 1951.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
Member of Congress,
House of Representatives,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: I have your letter of June 8, in which you quoted parts of two letters, one from Madisonville and one from Wills Point, Tex.

I do not have much comment to make in connection with these statements; however, I am of the opinion that the fact that peo-

ple are leaving the farm is not altogether bad. We have made progress in this country by increasing our production through the use of technology, and it does not require so many people to produce the raw products. At the present time it takes only about 10 percent of our people to produce the raw products, whereas in many other countries it takes 80 percent. We have the many conveniences, such as electricity, radio, television, cars, airplanes, good roads, and good churches and schools because we have been able to release people from the production of raw agricultural products.

I do not want to be misunderstood. I am not at all for corporation farming. I think we should have as many family size farms as is possible; however, it is my opinion that many of the farms in East Texas have been too small for a family to make a good living on. Just what size the farm should be is very difficult to determine, and, of course, that depends on whether the producer grows beef cattle, dairy cattle, or intensely cultivates crops such as potatoes, tomatoes, and vegetables.

I fully recognize that there are many people dissatisfied with the present administration; however, many of these dissatisfied people fail to understand the objectives of the present programs being administered, and, of course, these programs do work hardships on individuals. As I have discussed with you before, I am a firm believer in local administration. I think the laws enacted by Congress and administered by Government agencies should leave a great deal of latitude to the local people, for I believe local people selected by their neighbors are in a better position to administer justice in hardship cases than we can possibly have under any set of rules or regulations.

Very truly yours,

B. F. VANCE,

Chairman, State PMA Committee.

Cotton production in the United States by cotton State, by cotton county, 1950

[Counties were used for each State in the cases where complete information was available]

State and county	Number of cotton allotments	Total cotton acreage allotted	Number of cotton bales ginned	Total value of cotton	Average acreage per allotment	Average number of bales per allotment	Average value per allotment	State and county	Number of cotton allotments	Total cotton acreage allotted	Number of cotton bales ginned	Total value of cotton	Average acreage per allotment	Average number of bales per allotment	Average value per allotment
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Alabama:								Alabama—Con.							
Antauga.....	1,183	15,608	5,788	\$1,041,840	13.194	4.893	\$880.68	Houston.....	2,764	33,326	14,186	\$2,553,480	12.057	5.132	\$923.84
Barbour.....	1,702	18,813	5,515	992,700	11.053	3.240	583.25	Jackson.....	4,254	43,761	9,544	1,717,920	10.287	2.244	404.22
Bibb.....	774	6,716	2,456	442,080	8.677	3.173	571.16	Lamar.....	2,424	20,928	7,397	1,331,460	8.634	3.052	549.28
Blount.....	4,017	32,397	8,562	1,541,160	8.065	2.131	383.66	Lauderdale.....	3,971	48,569	16,324	2,938,320	12.231	4.111	739.94
Bulloch.....	815	16,139	4,056	730,080	9.802	4.977	895.80	Lawrence.....	3,183	61,337	27,292	4,912,560	19.270	8.574	1,543.37
Butler.....	1,856	14,848	5,058	910,440	8.000	2.725	490.54	Lee.....	1,183	14,435	5,673	1,021,140	12.202	4.795	863.18
Calhoun.....	1,803	14,637	2,845	512,100	8.118	1.578	284.03	Limestone.....	3,491	68,656	36,331	6,539,580	19.666	10.407	1,873.27
Chambers.....	1,416	19,543	8,265	1,487,700	13.802	5.837	1,050.64	Lowndes.....	823	17,495	4,925	886,500	21.258	5.984	1,077.16
Cherokee.....	2,142	35,917	15,809	2,845,620	16.768	7.380	1,328.49	Macon.....	1,616	25,558	9,950	1,791,000	15.816	6.157	1,108.29
Chilton.....	2,622	16,223	5,315	956,700	6.187	2.027	364.87	Madison.....	3,500	87,430	44,302	7,974,360	24.980	12.658	2,278.39
Choctaw.....	1,638	8,325	1,932	347,760	5.082	1.179	212.31	Marengo.....	1,951	28,330	9,116	1,640,880	14.521	4.672	841.05
Clarke.....	1,094	7,434	1,822	327,960	4.388	1.076	193.60	Marion.....	3,381	25,222	8,089	1,456,020	7.460	2.392	430.65
Clay.....	1,744	9,847	2,182	392,760	5.646	1.251	225.21	Marshall.....	5,015	52,687	17,716	3,188,880	10.506	3.507	635.87
Cleburne.....	1,192	8,540	1,313	236,340	7.164	1.102	198.27	Monroe.....	2,176	25,096	7,412	1,334,160	11.533	3.406	613.13
Coffee.....	2,088	24,717	9,647	1,736,460	11.838	4.620	831.64	Montgomery.....	1,171	19,249	5,757	1,036,260	16.438	4.916	884.94
Colbert.....	1,990	36,135	17,133	3,083,940	18.158	8.610	1,649.72	Morgan.....	4,125	48,774	19,690	3,544,200	11.824	4.773	859.20
Conecun.....	2,387	15,755	5,395	971,100	6.600	2.290	406.83	Perry.....	1,215	18,777	5,851	1,053,180	15.454	4.816	866.81
Coosa.....	988	4,073	770	138,600	4.122	1.779	140.28	Pickens.....	2,295	26,682	7,430	1,337,400	11.626	3.237	582.75
Covington.....	2,691	22,233	8,888	1,599,840	8.262	3.303	594.52	Pike.....	1,601	26,268	7,727	1,390,860	24.758	4.826	868.74
Crenshaw.....	1,644	17,902	5,540	997,200	10.889	3.370	606.67	Randolph.....	2,714	20,443	6,915	1,244,700	7.532	2.448	458.62
Cullman.....	6,829	61,493	23,234	4,182,120	9.003	3.402	612.41	Russell.....	831	16,297	4,297	773,460	19.611	5.171	930.76
Dale.....	1,341	10,563	3,378	608,040	7.936	2.519	453.42	St. Clair.....	1,878	12,779	2,529	455,220	6.905	1.347	242.40
Dallas.....	1,634	40,331	11,736	2,112,480	24.682	7.182	1,292.83	Shelby.....	971	9,305	2,966	539,280	9.583	3.085	555.39
De Kalb.....	6,034	55,395	15,109	2,719,620	9.180	2.604	450.72	Sumter.....	1,238	22,878	6,872	1,236,960	18.480	5.551	999.16
Elmore.....	2,240	26,818	12,272	2,208,960	11.972	5.470	1,002.25	Talladega.....	2,282	24,168	5,750	1,035,000	10.591	2.320	452.55
Escambia.....	1,588	12,330	5,813	1,046,340	8.394	3.661	658.90	Tallapoosa.....	1,545	14,057	5,314	856,520	9.098	3.459	619.11
Etowah.....	3,044	25,266	5,506	991,080	8.300	1.809	325.58	Tuscaloosa.....	3,264	30,546	10,845	1,952,100	9.358	3.323	568.07
Fayette.....	2,392	16,879	4,539	891,020	7.056	1.898	341.56	Walker.....	3,259	16,086	3,233	581,940	4.936	.992	178.56
Franklin.....	2,648	25,531	6,779	1,220,220	9.642	2.560	460.81	Wilcox.....	1,433	18,631	4,336	780,480	12.822	2.984	537.15
Geneva.....	2,116	25,153	13,613	2,450,340	11.887	6.433	1,158.01	Winston.....	2,282	15,710	4,010	721,800	6.884	1.757	316.30
Greene.....	1,342	21,453	6,258	1,126,440	15.984	4.063	839.37								
Hale.....	1,814	24,170	9,280	1,670,400	13.326	5.116	920.84								
Henry.....	1,322	19,406	8,352	1,503,360	14.679	6.318	1,137.19								
								Total.....	142,586	1,605,069	565,939	102,771,000	11.652	3.989	383.64

1 Rounded to nearest thousand.

Cotton production in the United States by cotton State, by cotton county, 1950—Continued

[Counties were used for each State in the cases where complete information was available]

State and county	Number of cotton allotments	Total cotton acreage allotted	Number of cotton bales ginned	Total value of cotton	Average acreage per allotment	Average number of bales per allotment	Average value per allotment	State and county	Number of cotton allotments	Total cotton acreage allotted	Number of cotton bales ginned	Total value of cotton	Average acreage per allotment	Average number of bales per allotment	Average value per allotment
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Arkansas:								Georgia—Con.							
Arkansas.....	1,430	13,028	6,841	\$1,231,380	9.110	4.784	\$877.68	Elbert.....	1,463	17,167	5,762	\$1,037,160	11.740	3.938	\$708.93
Ashley.....	1,057	29,007	20,430	3,677,400	27.443	19.329	3,479.09	Emanuel.....	1,415	23,580	8,379	1,508,220	16.664	5.922	1,065.88
Bradley.....	1,206	10,107	2,376	427,680	8.381	1.970	354.63	Fayette.....	802	10,725	3,564	641,520	13.370	4.444	799.90
Calhoun.....	839	7,780	1,639	295,020	9.273	1.954	351.63	Floyd.....	1,403	19,294	3,636	654,480	13.752	2.592	466.44
Chicot.....	1,729	45,230	23,027	4,144,860	26.160	13.318	2,397.26	Forsyth.....	1,466	10,971	656	118,080	7.484	.447	80.55
Clark.....	1,148	12,818	1,591	286,380	11.166	1.386	249.46	Franklin.....	1,642	16,791	6,831	1,229,580	10.226	4.160	748.83
Clay.....	3,544	48,408	24,746	4,454,280	13.559	6.983	1,256.85	Fulton.....	1,001	8,303	1,184	213,120	8.375	1.183	212.90
Cleveland.....	1,184	9,460	2,523	454,140	7.990	2.131	383.56	Glascocock.....	361	7,613	2,146	388,280	21.089	5.945	1,070.03
Columbia.....	2,732	24,717	5,916	1,064,880	9.047	2.165	389.78	Gordon.....	1,599	18,443	4,598	827,640	11.534	2.876	517.60
Conway.....	1,951	21,453	2,542	457,560	10.996	1.303	224.53	Greene.....	776	8,175	1,757	316,260	10.535	2.264	407.55
Craighead.....	4,032	58,578	56,725	10,210,500	21.225	14.069	2,532.37	Gwinnett.....	2,007	17,789	2,593	466,740	3.885	1.262	232.56
Crittenden.....	1,728	110,764	94,939	17,089,020	64.100	54.942	9,889.48	Hall.....	1,555	11,257	883	158,940	7.239	.568	102.21
Cross.....	1,536	44,561	36,968	6,654,240	29.011	24.068	4,332.19	Hancock.....	961	13,340	3,972	714,960	13.881	4.133	743.98
Desha.....	1,582	58,074	36,688	6,603,840	36.709	23.191	4,174.36	Harrison.....	1,231	8,376	1,159	208,620	6.804	.942	160.47
Drew.....	1,474	19,986	9,653	1,737,540	13.559	6.549	1,178.79	Harris.....	491	4,113	1,502	270,760	8.377	3.059	550.631
Faulkner.....	2,907	33,254	6,676	1,201,680	11.439	2.30	413.37	Hart.....	1,643	22,282	8,732	1,571,760	13.562	5.315	956.64
Grant.....	688	3,159	575	103,500	4.592	.836	150.44	Henry.....	1,245	20,303	7,857	1,416,060	16.308	6.319	1,137.40
Greene.....	3,521	46,691	23,236	4,182,480	13.261	6.60	1,187.87	Houston.....	555	8,941	3,257	586,260	15.825	5.765	1,087.63
Hamstead.....	2,510	28,668	4,819	867,420	11.422	1.920	345.59	Irwin.....	855	11,168	5,602	1,008,360	13.062	6.552	1,179.37
Hempstead.....	951	8,111	1,246	224,280	8.529	1.310	235.84	Jackson.....	1,506	21,620	8,128	1,463,040	14.356	5.397	971.47
Independence.....	1,584	16,695	2,460	442,800	10.540	1.553	279.55	Jasper.....	423	8,255	3,321	597,780	19.915	7.851	1,413.19
Izard.....	1,408	9,433	360	64,800	6.700	.256	46.02	Jefferson.....	1,149	28,714	10,158	1,828,440	24.960	8.841	1,591.33
Jackson.....	1,672	65,419	34,235	6,162,300	39.126	20.475	3,685.59	Jenkins.....	694	16,622	6,669	1,200,420	23.951	9.610	1,729.71
Jefferson.....	1,904	91,457	65,012	11,702,160	48.034	34.145	6,146.09	Johnson.....	848	21,421	9,004	1,620,720	25.261	10.618	1,911.23
Lafayette.....	1,122	22,582	9,628	1,733,040	20.127	8.581	1,544.60	Lamar.....	513	5,540	1,745	314,100	10.799	3.402	612.28
Lawrence.....	2,121	34,453	12,732	2,291,760	6.244	6.003	1,080.51	Laurens.....	2,170	39,054	17,880	3,218,400	17.997	8.240	1,483.13
Lee.....	2,348	69,975	48,502	8,730,360	29.802	20.657	3,718.21	Lowndes.....	791	3,594	1,265	227,700	4.544	1.599	287.86
Lincoln.....	1,468	47,313	29,117	5,241,060	32.230	19.834	3,570.20	McDuffie.....	564	10,931	3,823	688,140	19.381	6.778	1,220.11
Little River.....	752	13,300	3,447	620,460	17.686	4.584	825.08	Macon.....	693	17,826	6,989	1,258,020	25.723	10.085	1,815.32
Lonoke.....	2,830	70,131	35,601	6,408,180	24.781	12.580	2,264.37	Madison.....	1,517	17,343	7,900	1,422,000	11.432	5.208	937.38
Miller.....	1,122	24,187	5,460	982,800	21.557	4.866	875.94	Meriwether.....	1,157	18,529	8,644	1,555,920	16.007	7.471	1,344.79
Mississippi.....	3,399	228,713	160,970	28,974,600	67.290	47.358	8,524.45	Mitchell.....	1,096	13,237	6,061	1,090,980	1.312	.601	108.12
Monroe.....	1,711	40,670	25,726	4,630,680	23.770	15.066	2,706.42	Montgomery.....	518	6,124	2,237	402,660	11.822	4.319	777.34
Nevada.....	1,620	14,170	1,773	319,140	8.747	1.094	197.00	Morgan.....	795	21,899	10,868	1,956,240	27.546	13.670	2,460.68
Ouachita.....	911	7,287	1,022	183,960	7.999	1.122	201.93	Murray.....	934	7,902	885	159,300	8.460	.948	170.56
Phillips.....	2,605	90,201	51,964	9,353,520	34.626	19.948	3,590.60	Newton.....	808	13,707	5,199	935,820	16.964	6.434	1,158.19
Poinsett.....	2,072	96,376	76,511	13,771,980	46.514	36.929	6,046.71	Oconee.....	728	11,708	5,057	910,260	16.082	6.946	1,250.36
Pope.....	1,266	11,318	1,022	183,960	8.940	.807	145.31	Oglethorpe.....	1,163	13,897	4,586	825,480	11.649	3.844	691.94
Prairie.....	1,263	15,035	8,311	1,495,980	11.974	6.580	1,184.47	Paulding.....	1,081	9,946	1,406	253,080	9.201	1.301	234.12
Pulaski.....	1,194	32,504	13,851	2,493,180	27.223	11.601	2,088.09	Pike.....	643	11,287	4,089	736,020	17.554	6.359	1,144.67
Randolph.....	1,636	20,008	4,917	—885,060	12.230	3.006	540.99	Polk.....	1,323	13,589	2,328	419,040	10.271	1.760	316.73
St. Francis.....	1,911	86,342	68,106	12,288,960	45.182	35.638	6,414.91	Pulaski.....	544	11,186	5,103	918,540	20.562	9.381	1,688.49
Sharp.....	1,142	9,631	975	175,500	6.327	.854	153.68	Richmond.....	347	4,723	1,261	226,980	13.611	3.634	654.12
Union.....	1,219	8,003	893	160,740	6.565	.733	131.86	Rockdale.....	565	7,180	1,806	325,080	12.708	3.196	575.36
White.....	4,429	45,658	10,610	1,969,800	10.309	2.294	431.20	Schley.....	296	5,772	2,572	462,960	19.804	8.602	1,548.36
Woodruff.....	1,371	48,434	27,142	4,885,560	35.302	19.797	3,563.50	Screven.....	1,308	24,851	9,436	1,698,480	18.999	7.214	1,298.53
Yell.....	1,319	17,052	3,407	613,260	12.928	2.583	464.94	Spalding.....	508	6,951	2,354	423,720	13.683	4.634	834.09
Total.....	85,148	1,897,201	1,066,909	191,118,000	21.004	11.128	2,049.71	Sumter.....	784	14,382	7,438	1,338,840	18.344	9.487	1,707.70
Arizona:								Taliaferro.....	387	4,456	1,028	185,040	11.514	2.656	478.14
Graham.....	499	15,664	27,103	4,878,540	31.391	54.315	9,776.63	Tattnall.....	980	7,593	2,259	406,620	7.748	2.305	1,267.08
Maricopa.....	1,944	91,395	183,442	33,019,560	47.014	94.363	6,985.37	Taylor.....	563	10,242	4,093	736,740	18.632	7.206	1,297.08
Pima.....	66	11,159	25,102	4,518,360	169.076	380.333	8,460.00	Telfair.....	859	7,096	2,145	386,100	8.261	2.497	449.48
Pinal.....	1,037	117,561	220,555	39,699,900	113.366	212.686	8,283.41	Terrill.....	555	13,623	7,506	1,351,080	24.566	13.524	2,434.38
Total.....	3,546	235,779	506,202	82,116,360	90.219	185.428	8,376.35	Thomas.....	824	5,098	1,796	323,280	6.187	2.180	392.33
California:								Tift.....	858	7,549	3,510	631,800	8.798	4.091	736.36
Fresno.....	3,660	178,170	288,694	51,964,920	48.680	78.878	14,198.07	Toombs.....	973	10,629	4,396	791,280	10.924	4.518	813.24
Kern.....	2,100	165,402	291,297	52,433,460	78.763	138.713	14,968.31	Troup.....	645	5,594	1,094	196,920	8.673	1.696	305.30
Kings.....	1,080	91,191	126,535	22,743,900	84.436	116.995	21,059.17	Turner.....	670	7,321	3,006	541,080	10.927	4.487	807.58
Madera.....	1,260	52,749	58,613	10,550,340	41.864	46.518	8,373.29	Walker.....	1,350	8,317	885	159,300	6.161	.656	118.00
Merced.....	372	22,879	29,603	5,											

Cotton production in the United States by cotton State, by cotton county, 1950—Continued

[Counties were used for each State in the cases where complete information was available]

State and county	Number of cotton allotments	Total cotton acreage allotted	Number of cotton bales ginned	Total value of cotton	Average acreage per allotment	Average number of bales per allotment	Average value per allotment
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Louisiana—Con.							
Pointe Coupee.....	1,090	13,334	6,275	\$1,129,500	12.233	5.757	\$1,036.24
Rapides.....	1,588	20,042	14,455	2,601,900	12.621	9.103	1,638.48
Red River.....	921	22,279	9,189	1,654,020	24.190	8.891	1,795.90
Richland.....	2,000	54,260	29,710	5,347,800	27.130	14.855	2,673.90
Sabine.....	1,329	7,767	1,174	211,320	5.844	.883	159.01
St. Landry.....	4,055	48,158	23,300	4,194,000	11.876	5.746	1,034.28
St. Martin.....	1,632	12,537	5,732	1,031,760	7.682	3.512	632.21
Tensas.....	689	25,251	16,264	2,927,520	36.649	23.605	4,248.94
Union.....	1,864	16,870	3,265	587,700	9.050	1.752	315.29
Vermilion.....	2,284	15,293	4,838	870,840	6.696	2.118	381.28
Washington.....	1,628	11,422	3,047	548,460	7.016	1.872	336.89
Webster.....	1,422	15,997	3,749	674,820	11.250	2.636	474.57
West Carroll.....	2,080	30,372	17,670	3,180,600	14.602	8.495	1,523.13
Winn.....	613	3,358	363	65,340	5.478	.592	106.59
Total.....	54,270	877,503	407,689	338,840,200	16.517	8.407	1,473.57
Mississippi:							
Adams.....	336	5,907	971	\$174,786	17.580	2.890	\$520.18
Alcorn.....	2,179	21,566	6,978	1,256,040	9.897	3.202	576.43
Amite.....	1,677	15,867	5,864	1,055,520	9.462	3.497	629.41
Attala.....	2,520	23,715	8,211	1,477,980	9.411	3.258	586.50
Benton.....	1,005	14,424	6,113	1,100,340	14.348	6.083	1,094.87
Bolivar.....	2,185	162,546	123,603	22,248,540	74.392	56.599	10,182.40
Calhoun.....	1,843	20,262	8,543	1,537,740	10.964	4.635	736.70
Carroll.....	1,558	23,217	8,873	1,777,140	14.964	6.337	1,140.65
Chickasaw.....	1,642	22,131	9,423	1,696,140	15.412	5.739	1,032.97
Choctaw.....	1,436	7,655	2,768	498,240	5.331	1.928	346.96
Claiborne.....	622	8,760	2,887	519,660	14.084	4.641	835.47
Clarke.....	1,748	7,928	3,610	649,800	4.535	2.065	371.739
Clay.....	1,193	15,018	5,010	901,800	12.588	4.20	755.91
Coahoma.....	928	109,076	93,660	16,858,800	117.539	100.926	18,166.81
Copiah.....	1,888	13,506	4,185	753,300	7.154	2.217	398.99
Covington.....	2,116	16,180	5,839	1,051,020	7.647	2.759	496.70
De Soto.....	1,553	47,001	25,593	4,606,740	30.265	16.480	2,968.349
Forrest.....	600	2,381	595	107,100	3.968	.992	178.50
Grenada.....	868	16,372	9,906	1,783,080	18.862	11.412	2,054.24
Hinds.....	2,157	41,231	17,888	3,219,840	19.115	8.293	1,492.74
Holmes.....	2,100	51,762	28,765	5,177,700	24.649	13.698	2,465.57
Humphreys.....	1,232	63,686	45,256	8,146,080	51.693	36.734	6,612.08
Issaquena.....	485	19,145	9,519	1,713,420	39.474	19.627	3,532.82
Ittawamba.....	2,391	20,426	6,650	1,197,000	8.543	2.781	500.63
Jasper.....	2,185	12,576	5,529	995,220	5.756	2.530	455.48
Jefferson.....	784	9,572	2,688	483,840	12.209	3.429	617.14
Jefferson Davis.....	2,060	22,876	9,987	1,797,660	11.105	4.848	872.65
Jones.....	2,756	16,734	7,309	1,315,620	5.905	2.652	477.37
Kemper.....	1,766	19,567	5,682	1,022,760	11.080	3.217	579.14
Lafayette.....	1,812	23,366	9,908	1,783,440	12.895	5.468	984.24
Lamar.....	1,139	5,525	1,793	322,740	4.851	1.574	283.35
Lauderdale.....	1,913	10,553	3,706	667,080	5.516	1.937	348.71
Lawrence.....	1,552	13,604	4,208	757,440	8.823	2.711	488.04
Leake.....	2,958	26,611	11,645	2,096,100	8.996	3.937	708.62
Lee.....	2,458	40,389	13,987	2,517,660	16.432	5.690	1,024.27
Leflore.....	1,027	97,701	85,854	15,453,720	95.132	83.597	15,047.44
Lincoln.....	2,124	13,866	3,611	649,980	6.528	1.700	306.02
Lowndes.....	1,815	24,753	9,781	1,760,580	13.638	5.389	970.02
Madison.....	2,032	45,849	20,793	3,742,740	22.563	10.233	1,841.90
Marion.....	2,247	16,725	5,933	1,067,940	7.434	2.640	479.28
Marshall.....	1,816	40,027	16,972	3,054,960	22.041	9.346	1,682.25
Monroe.....	2,847	42,384	16,853	3,033,540	14.887	5.920	1,065.52
Montgomery.....	1,209	12,192	4,113	740,340	10.084	3.402	612.36
Neshoba.....	3,128	26,652	11,543	2,077,740	8.520	3.690	664.24
Newton.....	2,589	17,511	7,823	1,408,140	6.764	3.022	543.89
Noxubee.....	1,443	29,807	11,344	2,041,920	20.656	7.861	1,415.05
Oktibbeha.....	1,312	9,898	2,079	374,220	7.544	1.585	285.23
Panola.....	2,266	52,759	26,087	4,695,660	23.283	11.512	2,072.22
Pike.....	1,863	12,800	2,888	519,840	6.871	1.550	279.03
Pontotoc.....	2,720	29,756	10,395	1,871,100	10.940	3.822	687.96
Prentiss.....	2,151	24,546	10,057	1,810,260	11.411	4.675	841.59
Quitman.....	1,189	72,573	58,628	10,553,040	62.037	49.309	8,875.56
Rankin.....	1,924	16,771	5,958	1,072,440	8.717	3.097	557.40
Scott.....	2,129	17,610	7,602	1,368,360	8.271	3.571	642.72
Sharkey.....	653	39,364	24,624	4,432,320	60.282	37.709	6,787.63
Simpson.....	2,358	19,402	8,846	1,592,280	8.228	3.751	637.10
Smith.....	2,270	16,441	8,706	1,566,000	7.243	3.835	689.87
Sunflower.....	1,698	156,030	123,808	22,285,440	91.890	72.914	13,124.52
Tallahatchie.....	1,491	71,832	49,397	8,891,460	48.171	33.130	5,963.42
Tate.....	1,445	32,753	17,676	3,181,080	22.667	12.233	2,201.86
Tippah.....	2,129	25,750	8,173	1,471,140	11.155	3.839	691.00
Tishomingo.....	2,198	16,140	3,761	676,980	7.343	1.711	308.00
Tunica.....	2,667	66,682	52,072	9,372,960	99.973	78.069	10,052.41
Union.....	2,171	26,481	8,717	1,569,060	12.198	4.015	722.74
Walthall.....	2,071	21,452	7,038	1,266,840	10.358	3.998	611.70
Warren.....	723	9,635	5,172	930,960	13.326	7.154	1,287.63
Washington.....	1,651	114,864	86,977	15,655,860	69.571	52.681	9,482.65
Wayne.....	1,557	9,181	3,858	694,440	5.897	2.478	446.01
Webster.....	1,567	12,806	6,092	1,096,560	8.172	3.888	699.78
Winona.....	2,199	19,503	8,576	1,543,680	8.869	3.900	701.99
Yalobusha.....	1,279	16,284	5,780	1,040,400	12.732	4.519	813.45
Yazoo.....	1,551	59,641	36,796	6,623,280	38.453	23.724	4,270.33
Total.....	125,154	2,647,150	1,272,535	214,308,344	21.518	12.862	1,344.71
Missouri:							
Butler.....	3,329	25,315	10,113	\$1,820,340	7.604	3.037	\$546.81
Dunklin.....	3,734	93,652	63,315	11,396,700	25.081	16.956	3,052.14
Mississippi.....	1,262	35,490	19,074	3,433,320	28.122	15.114	2,720.54
New Madrid.....	2,528	122,947	66,173	11,911,140	48.634	26.176	4,711.69
Pemiscot.....	2,703	127,575	68,184	12,273,120	47.198	25.225	4,540.55
Scott.....	874	22,186	11,344	2,041,920	25.384	12.979	2,336.29
Stoddard.....	2,726	55,292	26,567	4,782,060	20.283	9.746	1,754.24
Total.....	17,156	482,457	264,806	47,658,600	34.615	15.605	2,808.89
New Mexico:							
Chaves.....	744	38,560	42,851	7,713,180	51.827	57.595	10,367.18
Dona Ana.....	1,828	53,117	76,343	13,741,740	29.057	41.763	7,517.36
Eddy.....	554	28,803	35,868	6,456,420	51.990	64.743	11,653.86
Lea.....	459	18,487	10,859	1,954,620	40.276	23.657	4,258.43
Total.....	3,585	138,967	165,921	29,865,780	43.288	46.940	33,796.83
North Carolina:							
Anson.....	2,273	24,155	9,026	1,624,680	10.627	3.971	714.77
Bertie.....	1,664	8,493	1,602	288,360	5.104	.638	173.29
Bladen.....	2,371	8,137	1,113	200,340	3.432	.469	84.50
Cabarrus.....	1,600	9,067	2,553	459,540	5.667	1.596	287.21
Catawba.....	2,415	10,428	1,696	305,280	4.318	.702	126.41
Chowan.....	673	3,122	568	102,240	4.639	.844	151.92
Cleveland.....	4,096	55,251	18,560	3,340,800	13.488	4.331	815.63
Cumberland.....	2,543	19,225	4,614	830,520	7.560	1.814	326.59
Duplin.....	1,604	7,730	1,232	221,760	4.819	.768	138.25
Edgecombe.....	1,518	17,936	3,319	597,420	11.816	2.186	393.56
Franklin.....	2,870	16,203	2,786	501,480	5.646	.971	174.73
Gaston.....	1,620	9,992	1,517	273,060	6.168	.936	168.56
Gates.....	1,123	4,280	799	143,820	3.811	.711	128.07
Greene.....	853	5,939	1,050	189,000	6.962	1.230	221.57
Halifax.....	3,212	31,390	7,058	1,270,440	9.773	2.197	395.53
Harnett.....	3,487	21,963	4,728	851,040	6.299	1.356	244.06
Hertford.....	1,248	5,641	1,000	4,520	4.520	1.555	73.10
Hoke.....	1,129	18,039	7,249	1,304,820	15.978	6.421	1,555.73
Iredell.....	3,753	20,461	7,237	1,302,660	5.452	1.928	347.10
Johnston.....	5,626	33,771	8,233	1,481,940	6.003	1.463	263.41
Lee.....	991	3,400	475	85,500	3.431	.479	86.28
Lenoir.....	815	4,391	614	110,520	5.388	.753	135.61
Lincoln.....	2,099	16,062	4,240	763,200	7.652	2.020	363.60
Martin.....	958	4,295	721	129,780	4.483	.753	135.47
Mecklenburg.....	2,115	16,567	4,876	877,680	7.833	2.305	414.98
Nash.....	2,781	19,031	4,390	790,200	6.843	1.579	284.14
Northampton.....	2,366	23,421	6,181	1,112,580	9.899	2.612	470.24
Perquimans.....	833	4,204	304	54,720	5		

Cotton production in the United States by cotton State, by cotton county, 1950—Continued

[Counties were used for each State in the cases where complete information was available]

State and county	Number of cotton allotments	Total cotton acreage allotted	Number of cotton bales ginned	Total value of cotton	Average acreage per allotment	Average number of bales per allotment	Average value per allotment	State and county	Number of cotton allotments	Total cotton acreage allotted	Number of cotton bales ginned	Total value of cotton	Average acreage per allotment	Average number of bales per allotment	Average value per allotment
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Oklahoma—Con.								Texas:							
Muskogee.....	2,925	47,433	2,541	\$457,380	16.216	0.869	\$156.37	Anderson.....	2,574	17,455	2,030	\$365,400	6.781	0.789	\$41.96
Okfuskee.....	2,540	28,992	594	106,920	11.414	.234	42.43	Angelina.....	677	4,831	1,309	235,620	7.136	1.934	348.04
Okmulgee.....	2,424	32,889	474	85,320	13.568	.196	35.20	Austin.....	1,694	23,509	6,699	1,205,820	13.878	3.955	711.82
Osage.....	736	11,781	732	131,760	16.007	.995	179.02	Bailey.....	1,370	90,576	6,355	1,143,900	66.114	4.639	834.96
Pawnee.....	1,303	11,840	548	98,640	9.087	.421	75.70	Bastrop.....	1,086	17,338	4,381	788,580	6.011	4.034	726.13
Payne.....	1,220	8,188	418	75,240	6.711	.343	61.67	Baylor.....	479	15,370	4,878	878,040	32.088	10.184	1,833.07
Pittsburg.....	1,849	19,291	488	87,840	10.433	.264	47.51	Bee.....	639	12,713	2,485	447,300	19.895	3.889	700.00
Pottawatomie.....	1,286	8,098			6.297			Bell.....	3,094	89,073	34,424	6,196,320	28.789	11.126	2,062.69
Roger Mills.....	1,311	20,889	6,195	1,115,100	15.934	4.725	850.57	Bexar.....	530	6,211	1,070	192,600	11.719	2.019	303.40
Stephens.....	1,779	20,118	600	108,000	11.309	.337	60.71	Bosque.....	1,057	17,740	3,664	659,520	16.783	3.466	623.95
Tillman.....	1,568	63,068	33,886	6,099,480	40.222	21.611	3,889.97	Bowie.....	1,716	30,483	3,153	567,540	17.764	1.837	328.82
Tulsa.....	635	8,035	(2)		12.654			Brazoria.....	533	11,360	6,274	1,129,320	21.313	11.771	2,118.80
Wagoner.....	2,112	29,878	1,097	197,460	14.147	.519	93.49	Brazos.....	527	25,729	10,603	1,908,540	48.822	20.120	3,621.52
Washita.....	2,711	86,283	40,694	7,324,920	31.827	15.011	2,701.93	Briscoe.....	354	18,234	3,785	681,300	51.508	.692	180.00
Total.....	72,953	1,166,943	283,380	142,906,000	16.137	3.688	590.62	Brown.....	798	1,290	931	167,580	1.616	1.167	210.00
South Carolina:								Burleson.....	1,290	36,481	17,611	3,169,980	28.280	13.652	2,457.35
Abbeville.....	1,608	10,466	4,869	876,420	6.509	3.028	545.04	Burnet.....	663	9,103	1,443	259,740	13.730	2.176	391.77
Aiken.....	2,379	36,233	13,218	2,379,240	15.230	8.592	1,000.10	Caldwell.....	853	29,301	9,611	1,729,980	34.351	11.267	2,028.11
Alendale.....	674	14,355	5,993	1,078,740	21.313	8.556	1,600.50	Calhoun.....	350	17,805	9,309	1,675,620	50.871	26.597	4,787.49
Anderson.....	4,216	54,968	16,763	3,017,340	13.038	3.976	715.69	Cameron.....	6,225	161,061	137,557	24,760,260	25.873	22.098	3,977.55
Bamberg.....	1,108	17,813	6,712	1,208,160	15.806	6.058	1,090.40	Camp.....	1,094	6,900	4,333	76,646	6.307	.396	70.06
Barnwell.....	1,338	27,040	9,938	1,788,840	20.209	7.428	1,336.95	Cass.....	2,958	22,965	2,436	438,480	7.764	.824	148.24
Calhoun.....	1,069	21,778	10,668	1,920,240	20.272	9.979	1,796.30	Cherokee.....	2,899	17,818	2,731	491,580	6.146	.942	169.57
Cherokee.....	2,235	24,387	4,462	803,160	10.911	1.996	349.36	Childress.....	890	52,630	16,398	2,951,640	59.135	18.425	3,316.45
Chester.....	1,490	18,322	6,311	1,135,980	12.297	4.236	762.40	Clay.....	646	83,118	1,672	300,960	128.666	2.588	465.88
Chesterfield.....	2,825	44,170	15,555	2,799,900	15.635	5.506	991.12	Cochran.....	405	7,710	12,976	2,334,960	19.037	32.040	5,765.33
Clarendon.....	2,766	38,816	20,975	3,775,500	14.033	7.583	1,364.97	Coleman.....	1,408	29,376	7,022	1,263,960	20.864	4.987	897.70
Colleton.....	2,399	13,811	3,231	581,580	5.757	1.347	242.43	Collins.....	4,200	124,380	23,308	4,195,440	29.614	5.550	998.91
Darlington.....	2,166	35,754	18,282	3,290,760	16.507	8.440	1,519.28	Collingsworth.....	1,271	75,156	19,089	3,436,020	59.131	15.019	2,703.40
Dillon.....	1,376	27,617	10,957	1,972,260	20.070	7.963	1,433.33	Colorado.....	1,047	13,447	3,704	666,720	12.843	3.538	636.79
Dorchester.....	1,577	13,132	6,070	1,092,600	8.327	3.849	692.83	Cooke.....	1,377	15,376	883	158,940	11.166	.641	115.42
Edgefield.....	1,380	15,454	7,246	1,304,280	11.199	6.251	945.13	Coryell.....	1,363	26,401	6,352	1,143,360	19.370	4.660	838.86
Fairfield.....	1,065	10,452	3,153	567,540	9.814	2.961	532.00	Cottle.....	664	65,711	24,213	4,358,340	83.902	36.465	6,563.77
Florence.....	3,681	36,764	12,833	2,309,940	9.988	3.486	355.87	Crosby.....	1,162	101,780	46,922	8,445,960	87.590	40.441	7,268.47
Greenville.....	4,297	36,377	7,151	1,287,180	8.466	1.664	299.55	Dallas.....	1,950	55,127	13,250	2,385,000	28.270	6.795	1,223.08
Greenwood.....	1,100	10,730	2,675	481,500	9.730	2.432	437.73	Delta.....	1,770	234,991	93,010	16,741,800	132.763	62.548	9,458.64
Hampton.....	1,154	10,349	4,331	779,580	8.968	3.753	675.55	De Witt.....	1,401	54,520	12,535	9,813,600	38.915	8.947	7,004.71
Kershaw.....	1,923	25,892	7,988	1,437,840	13.644	4.154	747.71	Denton.....	2,056	38,066	5,507	991,260	18.500	2.679	482.13
Lancaster.....	1,790	16,433	3,475	625,500	9.180	1.941	349.44	Dickens.....	1,515	23,091	6,494	1,158,120	15.578	4.247	764.44
Laurens.....	2,281	32,648	13,068	2,352,240	14.313	5.729	1,031.23	Donley.....	805	31,207	5,198	3,529,800	63.083	23.125	4,162.50
Lee.....	1,537	40,593	22,849	4,112,820	26.411	14.866	2,675.88	Duval.....	942	18,201	1,456	262,080	19.322	1.546	278.22
Lexington.....	2,098	16,692	5,819	1,047,420	7.956	2.774	499.25	Ellis.....	3,447	167,683	65,711	11,827,980	48.464	19.063	4,331.38
McCormick.....	738	7,845	2,039	367,020	10.630	2.763	497.32	El Paso.....	1,589	44,197	67,132	12,083,760	27.814	42.248	7,604.63
Marion.....	1,488	13,317	5,366	965,880	8.950	3.606	649.11	Erath.....	1,098	12,109	1,546	278,280	7.131	.910	163.89
Marlboro.....	1,188	50,074	26,892	4,840,500	42.150	22.636	4,074.55	Falls.....	2,831	97,614	41,840	7,531,200	34.480	14.779	2,660.261
Newberry.....	1,751	15,480	6,781	1,220,580	8.841	3.873	697.08	Fannin.....	4,131	16,726	7,293	1,312,740	28.266	14.779	2,660.261
Oconee.....	2,492	17,329	5,185	933,300	6.954	2.801	374.52	Fayette.....	2,928	38,795	10,751	1,935,180	13.250	3.672	600.92
Orangeburg.....	4,718	81,325	38,078	6,854,040	17.237	8.071	1,452.74	Fisher.....	1,481	85,480	39,416	7,094,880	67.718	26.614	4,790.60
Pickens.....	2,351	15,195	3,357	604,260	6.463	1.428	257.02	Floyd.....	1,045	51,676	23,971	4,314,780	49.451	22.939	4,128.98
Richland.....	1,562	12,002	3,548	638,640	7.684	2.271	408.86	Foard.....	359	16,970	4,109	739,620	47.270	11.446	2,060.22
Saluda.....	1,630	14,568	5,753	1,035,540	8.937	3.529	635.30	Fort Bend.....	2,152	71,048	32,419	5,835,420	33.015	15.065	2,711.63
Spartanburg.....	5,353	50,006	11,847	2,132,460	9.342	2.213	398.37	Freestone.....	1,948	27,371	5,207	937,260	14.051	2.673	481.14
Sumter.....	2,820	47,638	25,473	4,588,140	16.893	9.031	1,625.94	Gaines.....	668	43,635	11,799	2,123,820	65.322	17.663	3,179.39
Union.....	976	12,893	3,618	651,240	13.210	3.707	637.25	Garza.....	536	48,600	17,405	3,132,900	90.672	32.472	3,979.29
Williamsburg.....	3,556	33,989	15,670	2,820,600	9.558	4.407	793.19	Gonzales.....	1,332	23,466	4,823	868,140	17.617	3.621	551.76
York.....	2,185	28,639	8,549	1,538,820	13.107	3.913	704.27	Grayson.....	3,293	67,629	3,013	542,340	20.537	.915	164.69
Total.....	84,340	1,051,056	406,745	73,215,000	13.338	5.209	929.91	Gregg.....	417	3,109	368	66,610	7.456	.882	159.74
Tennessee:								Grimes.....	1,046	20,659	7,484	1,347,120	19.750	7.155	1,287.88
Benton.....	1,372	6,058	1,757	316,260	4.415	1.281	230.51	Guadalupe.....	1,623	31,672	8,549	1,538,820	19.514	5.277	948.13
Carroll.....	3,969	24,957	15,966	2,873,880	6.288	4.025	724.08	Hale.....	1,819	89,624	51,535	9,276,300	49.271	28.332	5,099.67
Chester.....	1,507	14,007	5,264	947,520	9.296	3.493	628.75	Hall.....	1,072	102,818	30,987	5,577,660	95.912	28.905	5,203.04
Crockett.....	2,228	32,139	25,139	4,825,020	4.556	11.283	2,030.98	Hamilton.....	1,187	13,059	1,840	331,200	11.002	1.550	279.02
Decatur.....	1,180	7,024	1,468	262,440	5.953	1.236	222.41	Hardeman.....	745	36,677	8,846	1,592,280	49.231	11.874	2,137.29
Dyer.....	2,479	42,488	26,698	4,805,640	17.139	10.770	1,938.54	Harris.....	347	5,193	1,198	215,640	14.965	3.452	621.44
Fayette.....	2,030	53,425	25,143	4,535,740	26.318	12.386	2,229.43	Harrison.....	2,249	25,876	2,477	445,860	11.506	1.101	198.25
Franklin.....	1,764	8,639	5,581	1,004,580	4.897	3.164	569.49	Haskell.....	1,868	119,264	67,789	12,202,020	63.846	36.290	643.48
Gibson.....	5,582	49,989	35,408	6,373,440	8.955	6.343	1,141.78	Hays.....	383	11,065	3,045	548,100	28.891	7.951	1,431.07
Giles.....	2,414	13,907	4,788	851,840	5.761	1.983	357.02	Hidalgo.....	5,962	142,173	105,691	19,024,380	23.847	17.724	3,190.94
Hardeman.....	2,145	26,908	10,848	1,952,640	12.545	5.057									

Cotton production in the United States by cotton State, by cotton county, 1950—Continued

[Counties were used for each State in the cases where complete information was available]

State and county	Number of cotton allotments	Total cotton acreage allotted	Number of cotton bales ginned	Total value of cotton	Average acreage per allotment	Average number of bales per allotment	Average value per allotment	State and county	Number of cotton allotments	Total cotton acreage allotted	Number of cotton bales ginned	Total value of cotton	Average acreage per allotment	Average number of bales per allotment	Average value per allotment
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)	(8)
Texas—Con.								Texas—Con.							
Live Oak.....	802	19,144	4,413	\$794,340	23.870	5.502	\$990.45	Tarrant.....	591	16,470	3,260	\$586,800	27.868	5.516	\$992.89
Lubbock.....	2,605	247,850	154,438	27,798,840	95.144	59.285	10,671.34	Taylor.....	1,353	36,657	10,974	1,975,320	27.093	8.111	1,459.96
Lynn.....	1,632	198,905	88,780	15,980,400	121.878	54.400	9,791.91	Terry.....	1,352	122,866	43,216	7,778,880	90.877	31.964	5,753.61
McCulloch.....	636	16,776	3,029	545,220	26.377	4.763	857.26	Throckmorton.....	255	5,980	2,987	537,660	23.451	11.714	2,081.02
McLennan.....	3,442	121,393	39,640	7,135,200	35.268	11.517	2,072.98	Tom Green.....	837	56,976	26,112	4,700,160	68.072	31.197	5,615.48
Madison.....	679	9,753	2,543	457,740	14.364	3.745	674.14	Travis.....	1,282	49,488	15,691	2,824,380	38.602	12.239	2,203.10
Martin.....	795	99,023	46,317	8,337,060	124.557	58.260	10,486.87	Trinity.....	623	4,785	1,848	332,640	7.681	2.966	533.93
Matagorda.....	762	16,759	7,307	1,315,260	21.993	9.589	1,726.06	Upshur.....	1,577	10,179	5,555	105,913	6.455	2.352	67.16
Midland.....	341	23,758	8,984	1,617,120	69.672	26.346	4,742.29	Van Zandt.....	2,601	39,234	6,066	1,091,880	15.084	2.332	419.80
Maverick.....	186	7,922	4,935	888,300	42.591	26.532	4,775.81	Victoria.....	1,010	25,962	11,348	2,042,640	25.705	11.236	2,022.42
Milam.....	2,245	63,902	21,137	3,804,660	28.464	9.415	1,694.73	Walker.....	848	7,838	2,134	384,120	9.243	2.517	452.97
Mitchell.....	1,022	67,784	38,570	6,942,600	66.325	37.740	6,793.15	Waller.....	516	7,255	2,082	374,760	14.060	4.035	726.28
Morris.....	887	7,242	529	95,220	8.165	.596	107.35	Ward.....	174	11,501	6,672	1,200,960	66.098	38.345	6,902.07
Motley.....	512	38,779	8,662	1,559,160	75.740	6.918	3,045.23	Washington.....	2,410	34,285	9,892	1,780,560	14.226	4.105	1,762.93
Nacogdoches.....	1,682	13,575	1,983	356,940	8.071	1.179	212.21	Wharton.....	2,407	81,361	37,850	6,813,000	33.801	18.925	2,830.49
Navarro.....	3,304	139,335	45,257	8,146,260	42.172	13.698	2,465.58	Wheeler.....	952	33,861	5,005	900,900	35.568	5.257	946.32
Nolan.....	747	41,297	20,106	3,619,080	55.284	26.916	4,844.82	Wichita.....	523	10,261	1,209	219,620	19.620	2.312	416.10
Nueces.....	1,711	99,589	45,449	8,180,820	58.205	26.563	4,781.31	Wilbarger.....	1,232	66,818	18,609	3,349,620	54.235	15.105	2,718.85
Panola.....	1,969	19,182	1,675	301,500	9.742	.851	153.12	Willacy.....	1,227	107,793	79,781	14,360,580	87.851	65.02	11,703.81
Pecos.....	282	17,110	9,703	1,746,540	60.674	34.408	6,193.40	Williamson.....	3,612	141,444	57,257	10,306,260	39.159	15.851	2,850.19
Red River.....	2,006	51,332	5,171	930,780	25.588	2.578	464.00	Wilson.....	797	9,114	1,490	268,200	11.435	1.870	336.51
Reeves.....	251	20,855	33,910	6,103,800	83.088	35.100	24,317.93	Wood.....	1,904	10,474	418	75,240	5.501	.220	395.17
Refugio.....	304	11,936	5,798	1,043,640	39.263	19.072	472.50	Young.....	584	10,896	2,615	470,700	18.658	4.478	805.99
Robertson.....	1,079	39,373	16,911	3,043,980	36.490	15.673	2,820.80	Total.....	217,922	7,549,039	3,222,907	512,934,180	39.097	42.362	2,755.31
Rockwall.....	717	32,676	7,200	1,296,000	45.573	10.042	1,807.53	Virginia:							
Runnels.....	1,770	89,754	28,706	5,167,080	50.708	16.218	2,919.25	Brunswick.....	1,497	4,437	614	110,520	2.963	.410	73.85
Rusk.....	2,967	26,403	3,013	542,340	8.899	1.016	182.79	Greensville.....	1,138	5,865	613	110,340	5.153	.538	96.96
San Augustine.....	743	8,271	1,889	340,020	11.132	2.542	457.63	Mecklenburg.....	1,171	3,970	720	129,600	3.390	.614	110.67
San Patricio.....	1,137	71,557	33,777	6,079,860	62.935	29.710	5,347.28	Nansemond.....	1,285	3,740	611	109,980	2.910	.475	85.59
Scurry.....	1,234	85,307	35,040	6,307,200	69.130	28.395	5,111.18	Southampton.....	1,521	7,456	1,522	273,960	4.902	1.000	180.12
Shelby.....	2,482	18,041	2,040	367,200	7.269	.822	147.95	Total.....	6,612	25,468	4,080	734,403	3.863	.608	109.44
Smith.....	2,695	17,600	1,861	334,980	6.531	.691	124.30								
Starr.....	1,298	25,910	3,763	677,340	20.434	2.968	534.18								
Stonewall.....	483	24,077	8,831	1,589,580	49.849	18.284	3,291.06								

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
PRODUCTION AND MARKETING
ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., January 11, 1951.

HON. LINDLEY BECKWORTH,
House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. BECKWORTH: This will acknowledge your letter of January 3 requesting information on cotton prices during 1950.

The following figures show monthly average prices for Middling $\frac{15}{16}$ -inch cotton in the 10 designated spot markets and mid-month average prices received by farmers for cotton, 1950 calendar year:

[Cents per pound]

Month	10-market Middling $\frac{15}{16}$ -inch	Midmonth farm price
1950—January.....	31.03	26.47
February.....	31.98	27.50
March.....	31.93	28.05
April.....	32.47	28.74
May.....	32.90	29.24
June.....	33.81	29.91
July.....	37.12	33.05
August.....	38.06	36.95
September.....	40.68	39.98
October.....	39.81	38.90
November.....	42.24	41.13
December.....	42.59	40.36

The average spot price for Middling $\frac{15}{16}$ -inch was 36.22 cents in the 1950 calendar year. The average for the August–December 1950 period was 40.68 cents. These are simple averages of the monthly average prices shown above.

Sincerely yours,

FRANK K. WOOLLEY,
Deputy Administrator.

Number of 1950 farm cotton acreage allotments and total acreage allotted by counties

[This report includes data for both old and new cotton farms]

Name of county	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted
Alabama:		
Autauga.....	1,183	15,607.6
Baldwin.....	704	2,346.6
Barbour.....	1,702	18,812.5
Bibb.....	774	6,715.5
Blount.....	4,017	32,396.6
Bullock.....	815	16,138.9
Butler.....	1,856	14,847.9
Calhoun.....	1,803	14,637.2
Chambers.....	1,416	19,543.2
Cherokee.....	2,142	35,917.2
Chilton.....	2,622	16,223.7
Choctaw.....	1,638	8,325.3
Clarke.....	1,694	7,434.4
Clay.....	1,744	9,847.4
Cleburne.....	1,192	8,540.2
Coffee.....	2,088	24,717.3
Colbert.....	1,990	36,135.3
Conecuh.....	2,387	15,755.1
Coosa.....	988	4,073.1
Covington.....	2,691	22,232.9
Crenshaw.....	1,644	17,901.9
Cullman.....	6,829	61,493.1
Dale.....	1,341	10,562.8
Dallas.....	1,634	40,331.4
De Kalb.....	6,034	55,394.6
Elmore.....	2,240	26,817.6
Escambia.....	1,588	13,329.5
Etowah.....	3,044	25,265.8
Fayette.....	2,392	16,878.5
Franklin.....	2,648	25,530.9
Geneva.....	2,116	25,152.9
Greene.....	1,342	21,453.2
Hale.....	1,814	24,169.5
Henry.....	1,322	19,406.1
Houston.....	2,764	33,325.5
Jackson.....	4,254	43,761.1
Jefferson.....	1,380	6,547.3
Lamar.....	2,424	20,927.8
Lauderdale.....	3,971	48,569.2

Number of 1950 farm cotton acreage allotments and total acreage allotted by counties—Continued

Name of county	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted
Alabama—Continued		
Lawrence.....	3,183	61,337.4
Lee.....	1,183	14,434.8
Limestone.....	3,491	68,655.5
Lowndes.....	823	17,494.8
Macon.....	1,616	25,558.1
Madison.....	3,500	87,430.3
Marengo.....	1,951	28,329.6
Marion.....	3,381	25,221.8
Marshall.....	5,015	52,687.0
Mobile.....	6,121	3,226.6
Monroe.....	2,176	25,095.5
Montgomery.....	1,171	19,248.9
Morgan.....	4,125	48,774.2
Perry.....	1,215	18,777.0
Pickens.....	2,295	26,682.4
Pike.....	1,601	26,268.4
Randolph.....	2,714	20,442.6
Russell.....	831	16,296.7
St. Clair.....	1,878	12,778.6
Shelby.....	971	9,305.3
Sumter.....	1,238	22,877.9
Talladega.....	2,282	24,167.7
Tallapoosa.....	1,545	14,056.8
Tuscaloosa.....	3,264	30,545.5
Walker.....	3,259	16,086.2
Washington.....	693	2,627.2
Wilcox.....	1,453	18,630.9
Winston.....	2,282	15,709.5
State total.....	145,924	1,619,813.8
Arizona:		
Cochise.....	235	5,679.2
Graham.....	499	15,064.0
Greenlee.....	139	1,611.2
Maricopa.....	1,944	91,395.0
Pima.....	66	11,159.0
Pinal.....	1,037	117,561.6
Santa Cruz.....	7	954.0
Yuma.....	186	3,561.0
State total.....	4,113	247,585.0

Number of 1950 farm cotton acreage allotments and total acreage allotted by counties—Continued

Name of county	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted
Arkansas:		
Arkansas	1,430	13,027.7
Ashley	1,057	29,007.1
Baxter	155	464.3
Boone	20	116.4
Bradley	1,206	10,107.2
Calhoun	839	7,779.8
Chicot	1,729	45,230.0
Clark	1,148	12,818.2
Clay	3,544	48,408.2
Cleburne	1,749	10,016.7
Cleveland	1,184	9,460.2
Columbia	2,732	24,716.9
Conway	1,951	21,453.1
Craighead	4,032	85,578.4
Crawford	208	2,282.9
Crittenden	1,728	110,763.7
Cross	1,536	44,561.1
Dallas	816	5,585.1
Desha	1,582	58,073.6
Drew	1,474	19,985.9
Faulkner	2,907	33,253.6
Franklin	505	2,792.0
Fulton	1,041	4,234.0
Garland	250	707.7
Grant	688	3,158.6
Greene	3,521	46,690.6
Hempstead	2,510	28,667.7
Hot Spring	632	3,435.4
Howard	951	8,110.9
Independence	1,584	16,695.0
Izard	1,408	9,432.9
Jackson	1,672	65,419.1
Jefferson	1,904	91,457.4
Johnson	242	3,195.6
Lafayette	1,122	22,581.8
Lawrence	2,121	34,452.9
Lee	2,348	69,975.1
Lincoln	1,468	47,313.0
Little River	1,752	13,299.9
Logan	1,259	8,789.7
Lonoke	2,830	70,131.1
Marion	101	346.2
Miller	1,122	24,186.5
Mississippi	3,399	228,712.9
Monroe	1,711	40,669.5
Montgomery	361	1,162.1
Nevada	1,620	14,169.5
Newton	49	138.5
Ouachita	911	7,287.1
Perry	505	4,858.0
Phillips	2,605	90,200.7
Pike	492	1,947.2
Poinsett	2,072	96,375.9
Polk	341	1,136.5
Pope	1,266	11,317.7
Prairie	1,263	15,035.4
Pulaski	1,194	32,503.5
Randolph	1,636	20,008.1
St. Francis	1,911	86,342.1
Saline	368	1,004.2
Scott	439	1,547.6
Searcy	308	1,188.0
Sebastian	605	2,707.2
Sevier	525	3,159.7
Sharp	1,142	9,631.1
Stone	449	1,260.4
Union	1,219	8,002.8
Van Buren	1,238	6,609.4
White	4,429	45,658.4
Woodruff	1,371	48,433.9
Yell	1,319	17,052.4
State total	97,806	1,965,883.0
California:		
Fresno	3,660	178,170.1
Imperial	54	1,027.7
Kern	2,100	165,401.7
Kings	1,080	91,191.1
Madera	1,260	52,749.3
Merced	372	22,878.9
Riverside	186	5,273.0
San Benito	1	46.0
San Bernardino	1	31.0
Stanislaus	4	62.6
Tulare	3,972	129,082.0
State total	12,690	645,863.4
Florida:		
Alachua	3	16.0
Bay	13	51.6
Calhoun	58	152.6
Columbia	151	396.2
Duval	2	7.0
Escambia	342	1,913.9
Gadsden	13	15.7
Hamilton	329	1,624.5
Holmes	1,212	6,369.7
Jackson	2,255	9,509.3
Jefferson	458	2,618.0
Lafayette	100	306.7

Number of 1950 farm cotton acreage allotments and total acreage allotted by counties—Continued

Name of county	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted
Florida—Continued		
Leon	341	1,955.0
Liberty	1	5.0
Madison	910	4,164.3
Okaloosa	413	2,461.9
Santa Rosa	802	5,498.0
Suwannee	389	959.3
Taylor	2	5.8
Walton	639	3,136.4
Washington	479	1,464.8
State total	8,912	42,631.7
Georgia:		
Appling	1,050	6,497.7
Atkinson	290	1,166.0
Bacon	672	3,297.1
Baker	351	3,556.4
Baldwin	414	4,494.9
Banks	949	7,449.5
Barrow	1,045	12,412.6
Bartow	1,248	24,789.1
Ben Hill	549	6,075.8
Berrien	711	3,341.0
Bibb	187	1,444.4
Bleckley	583	10,301.4
Brantley	32	50.0
Brooks	1,272	8,284.3
Bryan	99	433.1
Bulloch	1,770	22,007.6
Burke	1,414	49,753.4
Butts	483	8,982.9
Calhoun	353	5,526.1
Camden	4	1.7
Candler	595	8,543.2
Carroll	2,605	25,759.3
Catoosa	574	3,546.7
Charlton	4	11.1
Chatham	16	54.1
Chattahoochee	46	260.2
Chattooga	920	10,132.6
Cherokee	1,289	6,911.3
Clarke	506	4,510.1
Clay	305	4,489.7
Clayton	372	3,677.4
Clinch	73	196.1
Cobb	1,439	9,194.5
Coffee	1,128	8,422.4
Colquitt	1,773	19,322.1
Columbia	573	5,079.3
Cook	626	3,395.6
Coweta	1,139	14,507.8
Crawford	317	3,068.4
Crisp	628	11,999.2
Dade	320	1,388.2
Dawson	271	1,374.3
Decatur	691	3,321.9
DeKalb	378	2,311.5
Dodge	1,340	19,916.9
Dooly	1,063	23,846.0
Dougherty	237	2,322.4
Douglas	705	4,834.6
Early	1,158	15,753.2
Echols	54	175.2
Effingham	401	2,617.1
Elbert	1,463	17,167.0
Emanuel	1,415	23,580.0
Evans	370	4,315.0
Fayette	802	10,725.7
Floyd	1,403	19,294.0
Forsyth	1,466	10,971.2
Franklin	1,642	16,791.0
Fulton	1,001	8,383.3
Gilmer	50	188.5
Gloucester	361	7,612.8
Gordon	1,599	18,442.6
Grady	723	3,274.4
Greene	776	8,174.6
Gwinnett	2,007	17,788.6
Habersham	411	2,066.4
Hall	1,555	11,256.5
Hancock	961	13,339.8
Haralson	1,231	8,376.0
Harris	491	4,113.4
Hart	1,643	22,281.6
Heard	727	8,040.0
Henry	1,245	20,303.4
Houston	565	8,940.6
Irwin	855	11,167.8
Jackson	1,506	21,619.7
Jasper	423	8,255.3
Jeff Davis	557	2,672.1
Jefferson	1,149	28,713.6
Jenkins	694	16,621.9
Johnson	848	21,421.4
Jones	258	1,498.5
Lamar	513	5,539.5
Lanier	149	618.2
Laurens	2,170	39,054.2
Lee	361	3,370.3
Liberty	65	111.1
Lincoln	505	6,104.2
Long	177	602.5

Number of 1950 farm cotton acreage allotments and total acreage allotted by counties—Continued

Name of county	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted
Georgia—Continued		
Lowndes	791	3,594.2
Lumpkin	169	717.1
McDuffie	564	10,930.5
McIntosh	1	2.5
Macon	693	17,826.0
Madison	1,517	17,342.6
Marion	423	4,908.3
Meriwether	1,157	18,520.1
Miller	683	5,893.4
Mitchell	1,090	13,236.5
Monroe	440	4,165.0
Montgomery	518	6,123.7
Morgan	795	21,899.3
Murray	934	7,902.4
Muscogee	62	410.8
Newton	808	13,706.5
Oconee	728	11,707.7
Oglethorpe	1,193	13,896.6
Paulding	1,081	9,945.9
Peach	179	3,384.5
Pickens	521	3,151.0
Pierce	649	3,028.2
Pike	643	11,286.7
Polk	1,323	13,588.8
Pulaski	544	11,185.5
Putnam	341	3,782.6
Quitman	159	1,985.3
Randolph	569	8,980.1
Richmond	347	4,722.5
Rockdale	565	7,179.6
Schley	299	5,771.7
Screven	1,308	24,850.6
Seminole	580	4,904.4
Spalding	508	6,951.3
Stephens	429	2,829.3
Stewart	408	4,617.3
Sumter	784	14,381.6
Talbot	429	2,979.6
Taliaferro	387	4,455.7
Tattnall	980	7,593.4
Taylor	568	10,241.9
Telfair	859	7,085.7
Terrell	555	13,622.8
Thomas	824	5,098.0
Tift	858	7,549.4
Toombs	973	10,629.4
Treutlen	422	5,717.9
Troup	645	5,593.9
Turner	670	7,320.9
Twiggs	530	5,381.5
Upson	433	3,118.3
Walker	1,350	8,316.9
Walton	1,387	30,324.7
Ware	323	1,000.8
Warren	598	17,040.9
Washington	1,226	23,308.0
Wayne	521	3,812.4
Webster	278	2,339.4
Wheeler	549	5,711.1
White	465	2,627.3
Whitfield	1,379	7,231.3
Wilcox	951	15,366.0
Wilkes	1,016	10,960.1
Wilkinson	595	4,938.5
Worth	1,368	16,647.3
State total	114,092	1,399,537.3
Illinois:		
Alexander	327	2,579.4
Johnson	1	8.4
Pulaski	389	2,364.8
State total	717	4,952.6
Kansas:		
Chautauqua	1	6.0
Cowley	7	11.0
Montgomery	13	123.0
State total	21	140.0
Kentucky:		
Ballard	3	25.2
Calloway	468	756.3
Carlisle	111	361.6
Fulton	502	9,864.7
Graves	283	429.8
Hickman	538	2,280.2
McCracken	6	14.0
Marshall	156	214.4
State total	2,067	13,946.2
Louisiana:		
Acadia	2,151	22,018.3
Allen	682	2,738.6
Ascension	248	864.6
Assumption	5	29.0
Avoynes	3,926	31,193.2
Beauregard	310	979.8
Bienville	1,751	15,985.5

Number of 1950 farm cotton acreage allotments and total acreage allotted by counties—Continued

Name of county	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted
Louisiana—Continued		
Bossier	1,421	34,024.9
Caddo	1,438	55,919.6
Calcasieu	217	1,155.5
Caldwell	661	7,498.4
Cameron	376	1,775.7
Catahoula	996	15,267.0
Claiborne	1,889	28,377.9
Concordia	603	12,547.4
De Soto	1,740	22,301.9
East Baton Rouge	500	2,212.5
East Carroll	990	33,452.6
East Feliciana	789	8,283.3
Evangeline	2,138	24,660.5
Franklin	2,341	59,797.6
Grant	379	6,147.2
Iberia	409	2,703.6
Iberville	257	1,199.4
Jackson	571	3,391.5
Jefferson Davis	790	3,969.4
Lafayette	2,549	25,538.1
Lafourche	1	379.0
La Salle	258	1,085.0
Lincoln	1,305	15,581.0
Madison	720	22,874.3
Livingston	182	742.4
Morehouse	1,157	36,278.6
Natchitoches	1,805	40,479.5
Orleans	4	14.6
Ouachita	988	19,831.0
Pointe Coupee	1,090	13,333.7
Rapides	1,588	20,042.1
Red River	921	22,278.8
Richland	2,000	54,259.6
Sabine	1,329	7,767.0
St. Helena	924	3,536.1
St. James	3	7.5
St. Landry	4,055	48,158.1
St. Martin	1,632	12,536.9
St. Mary	8	72.5
St. Tammany	220	834.3
Tangipahoa	828	3,277.1
Tensas	689	25,250.6
Union	1,864	16,869.9
Vermilion	2,284	15,292.7
Vernon	1,122	4,718.6
Washington	1,628	11,421.8
Webster	1,422	15,997.2
West Baton Rouge	193	1,556.7
West Carroll	2,080	30,372.0
West Feliciana	311	3,497.2
Winn	613	3,357.6
State total	63,331	875,736.4

Mississippi		
Adams	336	5,907.1
Alcorn	2,179	21,566.3
Amite	1,677	15,866.8
Attala	2,520	23,714.8
Benton	1,005	14,423.5
Bolivar	2,185	162,545.5
Calhoun	1,843	20,262.4
Carroll	1,558	23,216.9
Chickasaw	1,642	22,131.2
Choctaw	1,436	7,654.8
Claiborne	622	8,759.7
Clarke	1,748	7,927.6
Clay	1,193	15,017.7
Coahoma	928	109,076.1
Copiah	1,888	13,506.3
Covington	2,116	16,179.8
De Soto	1,553	47,001.4
Forrest	600	2,380.5
Franklin	595	4,768.0
George	410	1,672.6
Greene	499	1,612.5
Grenada	868	16,371.9
Hancock	39	74.1
Harrison	37	62.7
Hinds	2,157	41,231.3
Holmes	2,100	51,761.7
Humphreys	1,232	63,685.5
Issaquena	485	19,145.3
Itawamba	2,391	20,425.6
Jackson	13	47.0
Jasper	2,185	12,575.6
Jefferson	784	9,571.9
Jefferson Davis	2,060	22,876.1
Jones	2,756	16,273.9
Kemper	1,766	19,566.9
Lafayette	1,812	23,365.7
Lamar	1,139	5,524.6
Lauderdale	1,913	10,552.8
Lawrence	1,552	13,694.2
Leake	2,958	26,610.7
Lee	2,438	40,388.5
Leflore	1,027	97,700.6
Lincoln	2,124	13,865.7
Lowndes	1,815	24,753.1
Madison	2,032	45,849.2
Marion	2,247	16,725.0
Marshall	1,816	40,027.4

Number of 1950 farm cotton acreage allotments and total acreage allotted by counties—Continued

Name of county	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted
Mississippi—Continued		
Monroe	2,847	42,384.0
Montgomery	1,209	12,192.3
Neshoba	3,128	26,652.0
Newton	2,589	17,511.0
Noxubee	1,443	29,897.1
Oktibbeha	1,312	9,897.8
Panola	2,265	52,759.1
Pearl River	128	372.3
Perry	729	2,587.9
Pike	1,863	12,799.7
Pontotoc	2,720	29,755.9
Prentiss	2,151	24,546.2
Quitman	1,189	72,572.5
Rankin	1,924	16,770.7
Scott	2,129	17,610.0
Sharkey	635	39,363.9
Simpson	2,358	19,401.7
Smith	2,270	16,440.7
Stone	118	329.9
Sunflower	1,698	156,030.4
Tallahatchie	1,491	71,831.9
Tate	1,445	32,753.3
Tippah	2,129	23,749.6
Tishomingo	2,198	16,139.8
Tunica	667	66,681.9
Union	2,171	26,481.1
Walthall	2,071	21,452.3
Warren	723	9,635.0
Washington	1,651	114,863.7
Wayne	1,557	9,181.1
Webster	1,567	12,805.5
Wilkinson	654	7,801.9
Winston	2,199	19,503.4
Yalobusha	1,279	16,284.2
Yazoo	1,551	59,640.6
State total	128,358	2,306,508.9

Missouri		
Bollinger	34	137.8
Butler	3,329	25,314.9
Cape Girardeau	15	294.7
Carter	6	21.3
Dunklin	3,734	93,652.3
Howell	29	114.7
Mississippi	1,262	35,489.8
New Madrid	2,528	122,947.0
Oregon	124	491.4
Ozark	27	121.5
Pemiscot	2,703	127,574.7
Ripley	836	4,713.3
Scott	874	22,186.0
Stoddard	2,726	55,292.4
Wayne	3	8.6
State total	18,230	488,360.4

Nevada: Nye		
	2	110.0
New Mexico		
Chaves	744	38,559.9
Curry	11	120.9
De Baca	54	240.3
Dona Ana	1,828	53,117.4
Eddy	554	28,803.2
Harding	9	44.0
Hidalgo	100	2,835.2
Lea	459	18,487.0
Luna	227	10,225.6
Otero	41	755.4
Quay	328	6,322.2
Roosevelt	928	15,997.8
Sierra	125	2,081.6
Socorro	107	865.7
Valencia	10	100.0
State total	5,525	178,556.2

North Carolina		
Alamance	142	350.9
Alexander	1,240	3,502.5
Anson	2,273	24,155.0
Beaufort	1,056	3,577.9
Bertie	1,664	8,493.3
Bladen	2,371	8,137.4
Brunswick	283	637.1
Burke	414	1,108.6
Cabarrus	1,600	9,067.4
Caldwell	110	240.1
Camden	434	1,862.1
Carteret	142	354.3
Caswell	3	6.6
Catawba	2,415	10,427.7
Chatham	1,013	2,943.1
Chowan	673	3,121.9
Cleveland	4,096	55,250.7
Columbus	1,492	4,969.7
Craven	544	1,457.8
Cumberland	2,543	19,225.4
Currituck	467	1,307.3
Davidson	820	2,131.6
Davie	1,327	4,624.3

Number of 1950 farm cotton acreage allotments and total acreage allotted by counties—Continued

Name of county	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted
North Carolina—Continued		
Duplin	1,604	7,729.6
Durham	108	328.9
Edgecombe	1,518	17,936.2
Forsyth	144	276.5
Franklin	2,870	16,202.6
Gaston	1,620	9,992.2
Gates	1,123	4,279.9
Granville	422	1,115.9
Greene	853	5,938.9
Guilford	158	363.3
Halifax	3,212	31,389.6
Harnett	3,487	21,963.2
Hertford	1,248	5,641.3
Hoke	1,129	18,039.2
Hyde	721	3,000.3
Iredell	3,753	20,460.5
Johnston	5,626	33,771.3
Jones	227	733.3
Lee	991	3,399.6
Lenoir	815	4,391.0
Lincoln	2,099	16,061.6
Martin	958	4,295.1
Mecklenburg	2,115	16,566.7
Montgomery	503	2,539.2
Moore	683	3,151.9
Nash	2,781	19,031.3
New Hanover	12	55.4
Northampton	2,366	23,421.0
Onslow	257	681.4
Orange	201	533.6
Pamlico	457	1,568.2
Pasquotank	455	1,547.3
Pender	293	811.6
Perquimans	853	4,203.6
Pitt	1,790	9,340.6
Polk	803	4,476.0
Randolph	192	389.0
Richmond	1,296	10,578.4
Robeson	4,739	53,704.1
Rowan	2,416	11,653.8
Rutherford	3,283	22,414.2
Sampson	5,044	32,703.4
Scotland	894	24,934.9
Stanly	1,781	7,069.4
Tyrrell	245	635.1
Union	4,577	33,173.2
Vance	1,289	4,817.7
Wake	3,108	14,614.5
Warren	2,761	14,565.0
Washington	469	1,498.8
Wayne	2,961	20,307.4
Wilkes	75	180.8
Wilson	2,082	13,114.1
Yadkin	129	253.6
State total	112,748	748,796.9

Oklahoma		
Adair	33	106.6
Atoka	1,068	6,021.4
Beckham	2,030	69,266.3
Blaine	931	13,039.1
Bryan	2,721	28,858.9
Caddo	3,969	64,905.1
Canadian	980	14,012.0
Carter	828	5,121.8
Cherokee	245	1,177.5
Choctaw	1,731	13,528.7
Cleveland	740	5,999.1
Coal	922	8,430.7
Comanche	1,478	18,845.3
Cotton	1,013	20,630.4
Craig	41	228.1
Creek	2,222	18,521.6
Custer	1,030	19,652.1
Delaware	5	15.0
Dewey	840	8,366.6
Ellis	75	495.3
Garfield	7	71.3
Garvin	1,775	16,356.8
Grady	2,981	27,835.7
Greer	1,445	52,037.4
Harmon	1,068	56,327.3
Haskell	1,590	11,411.9
Hughes	2,227	17,306.2
Jefferson	2,066	69,663.0
Johnston	1,173	31,916.3
Kay	685	5,595.8
Kingfisher	45	558.1
Kiowa	277	2,231.5
Latimer	1,945	56,061.1
LeFlore	479	2,120.3
Lincoln	2,097	15,203.8
Logan	1,986	13,009.9
Love	1,272	9,033.1
McCain	1,158	16,008.2
McClain	1,637	21,528.8
McCurtain	1,710	22,267.4
McIntosh	2,939	34,681.1
Major	170	1,216.5
Marshall	496	7,965.0
Mayes	653	3,755.2

Number of 1950 farm cotton acreage allotments and total acreage allotted by counties—Continued

Name of county	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted
Oklahoma—Continued		
Murray	357	2,158.4
Muskogee	2,925	47,432.7
Noble	481	3,196.5
Nowata	114	990.6
Oklfuskee	2,540	28,991.6
Oklahoma	359	2,914.6
Oklmulgee	2,424	32,889.0
Osage	736	11,780.7
Pawnee	1,303	11,840.2
Payne	1,220	8,188.1
Pittsburg	1,849	19,291.1
Pontotoc	1,051	5,867.8
Pottawatomie	1,286	8,097.7
Pushmataha	606	3,197.5
Roger Mills	1,311	20,888.6
Rogers	652	3,922.4
Seminole	1,548	8,827.7
Sequoyah	927	6,483.7
Stephens	1,779	20,117.6
Tillman	1,568	63,068.0
Tulsa	635	8,035.4
Wagoner	2,112	29,877.9
Washington	76	353.3
Washita	2,711	86,282.6
Woodward	34	202.4
State total	85,187	1,257,179.4
South Carolina:		
Abbeville	1,608	16,465.9
Aiken	2,379	36,233.0
Allendale	674	14,365.3
Anderson	4,216	54,968.8
Bamberg	1,108	17,512.6
Barnwell	1,338	27,039.7
Beaufort	714	1,631.9
Berkeley	2,006	10,733.5
Calhoun	1,069	21,778.2
Charleston	684	1,274.0
Cherokee	2,235	24,386.6
Chester	1,490	18,321.9
Chesterfield	2,825	44,169.5
Clarendon	2,766	38,816.2
Colleton	2,399	13,811.0
Darlington	2,166	35,754.4
Dillon	1,376	27,617.4
Dorchester	1,577	13,132.3
Edgefield	1,380	15,454.4
Fairfield	1,065	10,451.6
Florence	3,681	32,764.3
Georgetown	828	2,860.5
Greenville	4,297	36,377.4
Greenwood	1,100	10,730.0
Hampton	1,154	10,348.5
Horry	2,437	8,258.8
Jasper	727	3,329.2
Kershaw	1,923	25,891.7
Lancaster	1,790	16,433.0
Laurens	2,281	32,647.5
Lee	1,537	40,592.6
Lexington	2,098	16,692.1
McCormick	738	7,845.4
Marion	1,488	13,316.9
Marlboro	1,188	50,074.1
Newberry	1,751	15,479.5
Oconee	2,492	17,329.4
Orangeburg	4,718	81,325.0
Pickens	2,351	15,195.2
Richland	1,562	12,001.9
Saluda	1,630	14,567.7
Spartanburg	5,353	50,006.3
Sumter	2,820	47,638.3
Union	976	12,893.0
Williamsburg	3,556	33,988.8
York	2,185	28,638.8
State total	91,736	1,081,144.1
Tennessee:		
Bedford	750	2,753.7
Benton	1,372	6,057.9
Bradley	1,131	4,337.4
Cannon	55	82.3
Carroll	3,969	24,956.9
Chester	1,507	14,007.2
Coffee	762	2,532.3
Crockett	2,228	32,139.0
Davidson	11	39.3
Decatur	1,180	7,024.3
De Kalb	97	109.7
Dickson	2	5.4
Dyer	2,479	42,487.7
Fayette	2,030	53,424.8
Franklin	1,764	8,638.5
Gibson	5,582	49,989.0
Giles	2,414	13,906.7
Grundy	130	417.9
Hamilton	613	1,951.4
Hardeman	2,145	26,907.6
Hardin	1,977	14,692.2
Haywood	2,527	49,809.9
Henderson	2,600	24,239.6
Henry	2,307	9,181.4

Number of 1950 farm cotton acreage allotments and total acreage allotted by counties—Continued

Name of county	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted
Tennessee—Continued		
Hickman	17	53.6
Humphreys	2	5.0
Knox	5	28.2
Lake	567	27,063.0
Lauderdale	2,251	39,029.4
Lawrence	3,628	28,637.3
Lewis	201	654.6
Lincoln	2,032	16,940.4
Loudon	17	33.8
McMinn	1,419	4,485.7
McNairy	2,972	25,976.4
Madison	3,245	38,869.3
Marion	253	1,136.1
Marshall	225	758.3
Maury	169	431.3
Meigs	482	1,669.3
Monroe	724	1,772.1
Montgomery	2	1.0
Moore	55	197.8
Obion	2,006	15,071.3
Perry	79	381.5
Polk	521	3,496.3
Rhea	30	72.9
Roane	12	9.3
Rutherford	1	1.0
Sequatchie	1,939	9,283.1
Shelby	1	4.0
Stewart	3,977	65,051.6
Tipton	4	18.0
Van Buren	2,760	52,980.3
Warren	23	77.9
Wayne	432	1,232.4
Weakley	1,203	6,020.2
White	3,156	14,261.7
Williamson	88	227.2
Wilson	76	212.3
State total	74,249	745,967.3
Texas:		
Anderson	2,574	17,455.3
Andrews	56	3,024.1
Angelina	677	4,831.0
Aransas	20	1,145.6
Archer	151	1,718.2
Armstrong	25	924.6
Atascosa	601	8,477.6
Austin	1,694	23,508.9
Bailey	1,370	90,575.8
Bastrop	1,086	17,338.1
Baylor	479	15,373.0
Bee	639	12,712.9
Bell	3,094	89,072.9
Bexar	530	6,211.4
Blanco	85	440.9
Borden	224	19,316.4
Bosque	1,057	17,740.1
Bowie	1,716	30,482.9
Brazoria	533	11,359.9
Brazos	527	25,728.6
Briscoe	354	18,233.8
Brooks	267	3,659.7
Brown	798	7,118.3
Burleson	1,290	36,480.6
Burnet	663	9,103.4
Caldwell	853	29,300.7
Calhoun	350	17,804.8
Callahan	606	8,055.3
Cameron	6,225	161,060.6
Camp	1,094	6,900.6
Cass	2,958	25,964.7
Castro	339	9,105.9
Chambers	23	235.0
Cherokee	2,899	17,818.3
Childress	890	52,629.8
Clay	853	18,772.9
Cochran	646	83,118.1
Coke	405	7,704.7
Coleman	1,408	29,375.6
Collin	4,200	124,380.3
Collingsworth	1,271	75,156.0
Colorado	1,047	13,447.0
Comal	109	604.2
Comanche	842	6,332.7
Concho	425	24,492.9
Cooke	1,377	15,375.6
Coryell	1,363	26,401.2
Cottle	664	55,711.1
Crockett	1	85.0
Crosby	1,162	101,780.2
Culberson	8	246.5
Dallas	1,950	55,127.0
Dawson	1,770	234,990.8
Deaf Smith	81	1,905.9
Delta	1,401	54,520.1
Denton	2,056	38,035.6
De Witt	1,515	23,601.2
Dickens	848	53,494.0
Dimmit	30	626.9
Donley	805	81,206.9
Duval	942	18,200.8
Eastland	389	2,994.4
Ector	8	335.0

Number of 1950 farm cotton acreage allotments and total acreage allotted by counties—Continued

Name of county	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted
Texas—Continued		
Edwards	2	7.6
Ellis	3,447	167,682.8
El Paso	1,589	44,197.4
Erath	1,698	12,108.6
Falls	2,831	97,613.7
Fannin	4,131	116,725.8
Fayette	2,928	38,794.5
Fisher	1,481	85,480.2
Floyd	1,045	51,675.6
Foard	359	16,969.5
Fort Bend	2,152	71,048.4
Franklin	898	9,108.7
Freestone	1,948	27,371.3
Frio	60	1,085.1
Gaines	668	43,634.7
Galveston	4	23.5
Garza	536	48,599.7
Gillespie	173	773.2
Glasscock	102	7,924.3
Goliad	378	7,000.8
Gonzales	1,332	23,465.5
Gray	215	3,595.0
Grayson	3,293	67,628.7
Gregg	417	3,109.9
Grimes	1,046	20,659.3
Guadalupe	1,623	31,671.8
Hale	1,819	89,624.0
Hall	1,072	102,817.7
Hamilton	1,187	13,059.1
Hardeman	745	36,676.9
Hardin	19	53.9
Harris	347	5,193.7
Harrison	2,249	25,876.4
Haskell	1,868	119,263.6
Hays	383	11,065.1
Hemphill	80	1,673.2
Henderson	2,108	15,578.4
Hidalgo	5,962	142,173.3
Hill	3,844	157,521.0
Hockley	1,902	200,379.5
Hood	392	3,382.3
Hopkins	2,836	48,447.0
Houston	2,169	32,311.2
Howard	810	87,555.7
Hudspeth	129	15,145.0
Hunt	4,257	143,679.5
Irion	24	788.5
Jack	276	3,205.9
Jackson	707	17,761.1
Jasper	402	870.1
Jefferson	50	329.9
Jim Hogg	109	2,200.6
Jim Wells	869	25,925.0
Johnson	1,673	46,133.5
Jones	1,997	101,670.1
Karnes	1,662	44,431.8
Kaufman	2,577	95,007.5
Kendall	1	5.0
Kenedy	1	10.0
Kent	383	23,482.6
Kerr	3	11.4
Kimble	44	237.7
King	82	11,523.0
Kinney	3	290.0
Kleberg	314	8,894.5
Knox	997	71,804.6
Lamar	2,450	98,829.3
Lamb	2,471	186,700.4
Lampasas	372	3,347.5
La Salle	95	2,122.3
Lavaca	3,088	42,553.5
Lee	1,296	12,390.3
Leon	1,111	15,181.5
Liberty	382	3,446.9
Limestone	2,038	101,900.8
Live Oak	802	19,144.3
Llano	66	411.9
Loving	15	420.0
Lubbock	2,605	247,849.8
Lynn	1,632	188,905.3
McCulloch	636	16,776.4
McLennan	3,442	121,392.6
McMullen	74	1,596.4
Madison	679	9,752.9
Marion	891	5,086.2
Martin	795	99,023.3
Mason	145	1,249.1
Matagorda	762	16,758.5
Maverick	186	7,922.0
Medina	89	569.0
Menard	74	647.9
Midland	341	23,757.5
Milam	2,245	63,902.0
Mills	369	3,113.3
Mitchell	1,022	67,784.1
Montague	857	6,840.1
Montgomery	308	1,558.9
Morris	887	7,241.5
Motley	512	38,779.2
Nacogdoches	1,682	13,575.1
Navarro	3,304	139,335.4
Newton	337	715.6
Nolan	747	41,296.8

Number of 1950 farm cotton acreage allotments and total acreage allotted by counties—Continued

Name of county	Number of allotments	Total acreage allotted
Texas—Continued		
Nueces	1,711	99,588.9
Palo Pinto	269	3,138.5
Panola	1,969	19,182.1
Parker	510	3,272.9
Parmer	205	5,143.3
Pecos	282	17,110.0
Polk	434	4,893.2
Presidio	118	2,720.6
Rains	827	14,031.5
Reagan	18	593.1
Red River	2,006	51,331.9
Reeves	251	20,854.8
Refugio	304	11,936.4
Robertson	1,079	39,372.9
Rockwall	717	32,676.0
Russell	1,770	89,754.1
Rusk	2,967	26,402.5
Sabine	426	3,380.5
San Augustine	743	8,270.8
San Jacinto	426	3,491.5
San Patricio	1,137	71,557.2
San Saba	712	8,667.2
Schleicher	141	8,969.4
Scurry	1,234	85,307.1
Schackelford	210	2,955.9
Shelby	2,482	18,040.7
Smith	2,695	17,599.6
Somervell	196	1,906.2
Starr	1,268	25,910.2
Stephens	126	1,060.0
Sterling	7	80.3
Stonewall	483	24,076.8
Swisher	556	11,785.4
Tarrant	591	16,469.6
Taylor	1,353	36,656.6
Terrell	1	78.0
Terry	1,352	122,865.8
Throckmorton	255	5,979.8
Titus	1,229	10,415.2
Tom Green	837	56,975.9
Travis	1,282	49,487.6
Trinity	623	4,784.6
Tyler	149	526.9
Upshur	1,577	10,179.4
Uvalde	19	136.5
Val Verde	1	46.6
Van Zandt	2,601	39,234.1
Victoria	1,010	25,962.2
Walker	848	7,837.6
Waller	516	7,254.7
Ward	174	11,501.3
Washington	2,410	34,285.0
Webb	68	1,370.8
Wharton	2,407	81,361.2
Wheeler	952	33,861.1
Wichita	523	10,261.4
Wilbarger	1,232	66,818.2
Willacy	1,227	107,792.5
Williamson	3,612	141,444.0
Wilson	797	9,113.9
Wise	588	3,196.0
Wood	1,904	10,474.3
Yoakum	267	16,925.2
Young	584	10,896.3
Zapata	170	1,781.4
Zavala	153	6,344.6
State total	243,329	7,900,159.6
Virginia		
Brunswick	1,497	4,437.1
Caroline	1	5.0
Charlotte	30	80.8
Chesterfield	5	5.4
Dinwiddie	266	520.5
Elizabeth City	1	.4
Greensville	1,138	5,865.3
Halifax	12	21.9
Isle of Wight	405	963.2
Lunenburg	212	525.2
Mecklenburg	1,171	3,969.5
Nansemond	1,285	3,740.1
Norfolk	50	125.5
Nottoway	5	5.0
Prince George	91	138.6
Princess Anne	15	34.6
Southampton	1,521	7,455.9
Surry	44	74.4
Sussex	855	2,934.6
State total	8,664	30,903.0

Number of bales of cotton ginned in 1950 by counties

ALABAMA	
The State	572,638
Autauga	5,788
Barbour	5,515

Number of bales of cotton ginned in 1950 by counties—Continued
ALABAMA—continued

Bibb	2,456
Blount	8,562
Bullock	4,056
Butler	5,058
Calhoun	2,845
Chambers	8,265
Cherokee	15,809
Chilton	5,315
Choctaw	1,932
Clarke	1,822
Clay	2,182
Cleburne	1,313
Coffee	9,647
Colbert	17,133
Conecuh	5,395
Coosa	770
Covington	8,888
Crenshaw	5,540
Cullman	23,234
Dale	3,378
Dallas	11,736
De Kalb	15,109
Elmore	12,272
Escambia	5,813
Etowah	5,506
Fayette	4,539
Franklin	6,779
Geneva	13,613
Greene	6,258
Hale	9,280
Henry	8,352
Houston	14,186
Jackson	9,544
Lamar	7,397
Lauderdale	16,324
Lawrence	27,292
Lee	5,673
Limestone	36,331
Lowndes	4,925
Macon	9,950
Madison	44,302
Marengo	9,116
Marion	8,089
Marshall	17,716
Monroe	7,412
Montgomery	5,757
Morgan	19,690
Perry	5,851
Pickens	9,430
Pike	7,727
Randolph	6,915
Russell	4,297
St. Clair	2,529
Shelby	2,996
Sumter	6,872
Talladega	5,750
Tallapoosa	5,314
Tuscaloosa	10,845
Walker	3,233
Wilcox	4,336
Winston	4,010
All other	4,669

ARIZONA

The State	467,142
Graham	27,103
Maricopa	183,442
Pima	25,102
Pinal	220,555
All other	10,940

ARKANSAS

The State	1,072,005
Arkansas	6,841
Ashley	20,430
Bradley	2,376
Calhoun	1,639
Chicot	23,027
Clark	1,591
Clay	24,746
Cleveland	2,523
Columbia	5,916
Conway	2,542
Craighead	56,725

Number of bales of cotton ginned in 1950 by counties—Continued
ARKANSAS—continued

Crittenden	94,939
Cross	36,968
Desha	36,688
Drew	9,653
Faulkner	6,676
Grant	575
Greene	23,236
Hempstead	4,819
Howard	1,246
Independence	2,460
Izard	360
Jackson	34,235
Jefferson	65,012
Lafayette	9,628
Lawrence	12,732
Lee	48,502
Lincoln	29,117
Little River	3,447
Lonoke	35,601
Miller	5,460
Mississippi	160,970
Monroe	25,726
Nevada	1,773
Ouachita	1,022
Phillips	51,964
Poinsett	76,511
Pope	1,022
Prairie	8,311
Pulaski	13,851
Randolph	4,917
St. Francis	68,105
Sharp	975
Union	893
White	10,610
Woodruff	27,142
Yell	3,407
All other	5,096

CALIFORNIA

The State	981,910
Fresno	288,694
Kern	291,297
Kings	126,355
Madera	58,613
Merced	29,603
Tulare	180,505
All other	6,843

FLORIDA

The State	13,979
-----------	--------

GEORGIA

The State	490,363
-----------	---------

Baldwin	1,712
Banks	2,612
Barrow	3,877
Bartow	10,035
Ben Hill	1,811
Bleckley	5,827
Brooks	3,613
Bulloch	9,640
Calhoun	2,650
Burke	17,843
Butts	3,531
Candler	4,334
Carroll	5,689
Chattooga	1,061
Cherokee	175
Clarke	1,328
Cobb	310
Coffee	2,496
Colquitt	12,346
Coweta	4,896
Crisp	5,759
Dodge	8,726
Dooly	10,821
Early	7,392
Elbert	5,762
Emanuel	8,379
Fayette	3,564
Floyd	3,636
Forsyth	656
Franklin	6,831
Fulton	1,184
Glascock	2,146

Number of bales of cotton ginned in 1950 by
counties—Continued

GEORGIA—continued	
Gordon	4,598
Greene	1,757
Gwinnett	2,593
Hall	833
Hancock	3,972
Haralson	1,159
Harris	1,502
Hart	8,732
Henry	7,867
Houston	3,257
Irwin	5,602
Jackson	8,123
Jasper	3,321
Jefferson	10,158
Jenkins	6,669
Johnson	9,004
Lamar	1,745
Laurens	17,830
Lowndes	1,265
McDuffie	3,823
Macon	6,989
Madison	7,900
Meriwether	8,644
Mitchell	6,061
Montgomery	2,237
Morgan	10,868
Murray	885
Newton	5,199
Oconee	5,057
Oglethorpe	4,586
Paulding	1,406
Pike	4,089
Polk	2,328
Pulaski	5,103
Richmond	1,261
Rockdale	1,806
Schley	2,572
Screven	9,436
Spalding	2,354
Sumter	7,438
Taliaferro	1,028
Tattnall	2,259
Taylor	4,093
Telfair	2,145
Terrell	7,506
Thomas	1,796
Tift	3,510
Toombs	4,396
Troup	1,094
Turner	3,006
Walker	885
Walton	14,451
Warren	6,142
Washington	8,000
Whitfield	889
Wilcox	6,111
Wilkes	2,700
Wilkinson	693
Worth	8,656
All other	50,227

ILLINOIS

The State..... 1,302

KENTUCKY

The State..... 5,898

LOUISIANA

The State..... 418,978

Acadia	11,188
Avoyelles	16,385
Blenville	1,941
Bossier	22,682
Caddo	39,116
Catahoula	6,665
Claborn	4,578
Concordia	7,658
De Soto	4,165
East Carroll	18,105
East Feliciana	1,495
Evangeline	13,213
Franklin	33,349
Grant	2,398
Lafayette	11,925
Lincoln	1,724
Madison	15,867

Number of bales of cotton ginned in 1950 by
counties—Continued

LOUISIANA—continued	
Morehouse	23,016
Natchitoches	22,457
Cusachita	10,731
Pointe Coupee	6,275
Rapides	14,455
Red River	9,189
Richland	29,710
Sabine	1,174
St. Landry	23,300
St. Martin	5,732
Tensas	3,265
Union	4,838
Vermilion	3,047
Washington	3,749
Webster	17,670
West Carroll	363
Winn	11,289
All other	16,264

MISSISSIPPI

The State..... 1,307,412

Adams	971
Alcorn	6,978
Amite	5,864
Attala	8,211
Benton	6,113
Bolivar	123,603
Calhoun	8,543
Carroll	9,873
Chickasaw	9,423
Choctaw	2,768
Claborn	2,887
Clarke	3,610
Clay	5,010
Coahoma	93,660
Copiah	4,185
Covington	5,839
De Soto	25,593
Forrest	595
Grenada	9,906
Hinds	17,888
Holmes	28,765
Humphreys	45,256
Issaquena	9,519
Itawamba	6,650
Jasper	5,529
Jefferson	2,688
Jefferson Davis	9,987
Jones	7,309
Kemper	5,632
Lafayette	9,908
Lamar	1,793
Lauderdale	3,706
Lawrence	4,208
Leake	11,645
Lee	13,987
Leflore	85,854
Lincoln	3,611
Lowndes	9,781
Madison	20,793
Marion	5,933
Marshall	16,972
Monroe	16,853
Montgomery	4,113
Neshoba	11,543
Newton	7,823
Noxubee	11,344
Oktibbeha	2,079
Panola	26,037
Pike	2,888
Pontotoc	10,395
Prentiss	10,057
Quitman	58,628
Rankin	5,958
Scott	7,602
Sharkey	24,624
Simpson	8,846
Smith	8,706
Sunflower	123,808
Tallahatchie	49,397
Tate	17,676
Tippah	8,173
Tishomingo	3,761
Tunica	52,072
Union	8,717
Walthall	7,038
Warren	5,172

Number of bales of cotton ginned in 1950 by
counties—Continued

MISSISSIPPI—continued	
Washington	86,977
Wayne	3,858
Webster	6,092
Winston	8,576
Yalobusha	5,780
Yazoo	36,796
All other	4,877

MISSOURI

The State..... 266,040

Butler	10,113
Dunklin	63,315
Mississippi	19,074
New Madrid	66,173
Pemiscot	68,184
Scott	11,344
Stoddard	26,567
All other	1,270

NEW MEXICO

The State..... 188,506

Chaves	42,851
Dona Ana	76,343
Eddy	35,868
Lea	10,859
All other	22,585

NORTH CAROLINA

The State..... 189,656

Anson	9,026
Bertie	1,602
Bladen	1,113
C. barrus	2,553
Catawba	1,696
Chowan	568
Cleveland	18,560
Cumberland	4,614
Duplin	1,232
Edgecombe	3,319
Franklin	2,786
Gaston	1,517
Gates	799
Greene	1,050
Halifax	7,058
Harnett	4,728
Hoke	7,249
Iredell	7,237
Johnston	8,233
Lee	475
Lenoir	614
Lincoln	4,240
Martin	721
Mecklenburg	4,876
Nash	4,390
Northampton	6,181
Perquimans	304
Pitt	1,337
Polk	484
Richmond	3,563
Robeson	21,397
Rowan	5,716
Rutherford	2,279
Sampson	7,354
Scotland	10,649
Stanly	1,274
Union	8,209
Wake	1,786
Warren	2,207
Wayne	4,696
Willson	2,452
All other	9,512

OKLAHOMA

The State..... 242,293

Beckham	19,936
Blaine	3,561
Bryan	1,292
Caddo	12,230
Canadian	2,986
Choctaw	653
Comanche	2,819
Cotton	4,872
Creek	99

Number of bales of cotton ginned in 1950 by
counties—Continued

OKLAHOMA—continued

Custer	7,613
Dewey	1,737
Garvin	884
Grady	3,985
Greer	14,836
Harmon	17,626
Haskell	442
Hughes	117
Jackson	22,847
Jefferson	3,916
Kiowa	21,593
Le Flore	762
Lincoln	142
Logan	505
McClain	1,719
McCurtain	2,314
McIntosh	1,127
Muskogee	2,541
Okfuskee	594
Okmulgee	474
Osage	732
Pawnee	548
Payne	418
Pittsburg	488
Roger Mills	6,195
Stephens	600
Tillman	33,886
Wagoner	1,097
Washita	40,694
All other	3,913

SOUTH CAROLINA

The State

Abbeville	4,869
Aiken	13,218
Allendale	5,993
Anderson	16,763
Bamberg	6,712
Barnwell	9,938
Calhoun	10,668
Cherokee	4,462
Chester	6,311
Chesterfield	15,555
Clarendon	20,975
Colleton	3,231
Darlington	18,282
Dillon	10,957
Dorchester	6,070
Edgefield	7,246
Fairfield	3,153
Florence	12,833
Greenville	7,151
Greenwood	2,675
Hampton	4,331
Kershaw	7,988
Lancaster	3,475
Laurens	13,068
Lee	22,849
Lexington	5,819
McCormick	2,039
Marion	5,366
Marlboro	26,892
Newberry	6,781
Oconee	5,185
Orangeburg	38,078
Pickens	3,357
Richland	3,548
Saluda	5,753
Spartanburg	11,847
Sumter	25,473
Union	3,618
Williamsburg	15,670
York	8,549
All other	7,204

TENNESSEE

The State

Benton	1,757
Carroll	15,966
Chester	5,264
Crockett	25,139
Decatur	1,458
Dyer	26,698

Number of bales of cotton ginned in 1950 by
counties—Continued

TENNESSEE—continued

Fayette	25,143
Franklin	3,581
Gibson	35,408
Giles	4,788
Hardeman	10,848
Hardin	3,486
Haywood	36,563
Henderson	9,135
Henry	4,150
Lake	21,674
Lauderdale	31,208
Lawrence	10,177
Lincoln	8,034
McNairy	6,902
Madison	24,234
Obion	7,883
Rutherford	4,602
Shelby	28,887
Tipton	38,969
Weakley	6,976
All other	5,414

TEXAS

The State

Anderson	2,030
Angelina	1,309
Austin	6,699
Bailey	6,355
Bastrop	4,381
Baylor	4,878
Bee	2,485
Bell	34,424
Bexar	1,070
Bosque	3,664
Bowie	3,153
Brazoria	6,274
Brazos	10,603
Briscoe	3,785
Brown	931
Burleson	17,611
Burnet	1,443
Caldwell	9,611
Calhoun	9,309
Cameron	137,557
Cass	2,436
Cherokee	2,731
Childress	16,398
Clay	1,672
Cochran	12,976
Coleman	7,023
Collin	23,308
Collingsworth	19,089
Colorado	3,704
Cooke	883
Coryell	6,352
Cottle	24,213
Crosby	46,922
Dallas	13,250
Dawson	93,010
Delta	12,535
Denton	5,507
De Witt	6,434
Dickens	19,610
Donley	5,198
Duval	1,456
Ellis	65,711
El Paso	67,132
Erath	1,546
Falls	41,840
Fannin	7,293
Fayette	10,751
Fisher	39,416
Floyd	23,971
Foard	4,109
Fort Bend	32,419
Frestone	5,207
Gaines	11,799
Garza	17,405
Gonzales	4,823
Grayson	3,013
Grimes	7,484
Guadalupe	8,549
Hale	51,535
Hall	30,987
Hamilton	1,840
Hardeman	8,846

Number of bales of cotton ginned in 1950 by
counties—Continued

TEXAS—continued

Harris	1,198
Harrison	2,477
Haskell	67,789
Hays	3,045
Hidalgo	105,691
Hill	54,953
Hockley	75,040
Hopkins	6,570
Houston	8,669
Howard	49,158
Hudspeth	21,514
Hunt	19,910
Jackson	6,957
Jim Wells	4,833
Johnson	14,394
Jones	38,501
Karnes	10,245
Kaufman	22,993
Kent	8,601
King	5,057
Knox	31,481
Lamar	12,098
Lamb	57,524
Lavaca	12,602
Lee	2,482
Leon	3,162
Liberty	1,413
Limestone	30,126
Live Oak	4,413
Lubbock	154,438
Lynn	88,780
McCulloch	3,029
McLennan	39,640
Madison	2,543
Martin	46,317
Matagorda	7,307
Maverick	8,984
Midland	4,935
Milam	21,137
Mitchell	38,570
Morris	529
Motley	8,662
Nacogdoches	1,983
Navarro	45,257
Nolan	20,106
Nueces	45,449
Panola	1,675
Pecos	9,703
Red River	5,171
Reeves	33,910
Refugio	5,793
Robertson	16,911
Rockwall	7,200
Runnels	28,706
Rusk	3,013
San Augustine	1,889
San Patricio	33,777
Scurry	35,040
Shelby	2,040
Smith	1,861
Starr	3,763
Stonewall	8,831
Tarrant	3,260
Taylor	10,974
Terry	43,216
Throckmorton	2,987
Tom Green	26,112
Travis	15,691
Trinity	1,848
Van Zandt	6,066
Victoria	11,348
Walker	2,134
Waller	2,082
Ward	6,672
Washington	9,892
Wharton	37,850
Wheeler	5,005
Wichita	1,209
Willbarger	18,609
Willacy	79,781
Williamson	51,257
Wilson	1,490
Wood	418
Young	2,615
All other	68,405

Number of bales of cotton ginned in 1950 by counties—Continued

VIRGINIA	
The State.....	4,624
Brunswick.....	614
Greensville.....	613
Mecklenburg.....	720
Nansemond.....	611
Southampton.....	1,522
All other.....	544

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent permission to extend remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, or to revise and extend remarks, was granted to:

Mr. FERNOS-ISERN in two instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MANSFIELD and to include a speech he made on foreign policy of the United States before the Montana Bar Association on June 30, 1951.

Mr. RIVERS and to include a sermon.

Mr. KILDAY and to include a portion of a broadcast by Mr. Bill Downs over the Columbia Broadcasting System.

Mr. WILSON of Texas and to include an article.

Mr. BRYSON and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. LANE in three instances and to include some news items.

Mr. MORANO and to include an editorial.

Mr. ANGELL, Mr. MEADER, and Mr. VAN ZANDT in two instances and to include extraneous matter in each.

Mr. AYRES in two instances and to include a letter.

Mr. SHEEHAN and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. BOW and to include an editorial.

Mr. HOEVEN and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. BERRY and to include a telegram from Harry J. Devereaux to Eric Johnston.

Mr. SHAFER in three instances.

Mr. CARNAHAN and to include an address by General Eisenhower.

Mr. RIBICOFF and to include a speech by Jesse W. Randall.

Mrs. BOSONE and to include excerpts from a letter received by her.

Mr. GREEN and to include an article by James B. Carey that appeared in Labor and Nation, spring 1951 issue.

Mr. RHODES and to include a radio address delivered by him.

Mr. KEOGH (at the request of Mr. MULTER) and to include an article from the Herald-Tribune.

Mr. O'BRIEN of Michigan and to include a newspaper article.

Mr. BURDICK and to include a short article from the National Grange.

Mr. MCKINNON in two instances and to include extraneous material.

Mr. MCGREGOR in two instances and to include in one an article by Louis Bromfield and in the other a newspaper article.

Mr. LECOMPTTE and to include a statement on the price-control bill by Mr. Zed Hughes, of Corydon, Iowa, appearing in the Corydon (Iowa) Times-Republican on July 5.

Mr. SADLAK in two instances and to include in each a newspaper article.

Mr. POULSON in four instances and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. BENDER and to include a few telegrams.

Mr. BECKWORTH and to include two articles.

Mr. KLEIN (at the request of Mr. PRIEST) and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. MULTER to revise and extend his remarks on the Hope amendment and to include a tabulation of figures furnished by the Department of Agriculture on farm income for the month of May 1951.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN to revise and extend and to include extraneous matter.

Mr. HAND to revise and extend and to include pertinent correspondence and other material.

Mr. DORN and to include a certain article.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. PRIEST. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 36 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday July 11, 1951, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

596. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend the act approved March 3, 1899 (30 Stat. 1045, 1057, ch. 422) so as to provide for the appointment of special policemen by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

597. A letter from the President, Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill entitled "A bill to amend section 15 of the District of Columbia Alcoholic Beverage Control Act"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. ROONEY: Committee on Appropriations. H. R. 4740. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 685). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 1696. An act to amend Public Law 587 of the Eighty-first Congress (approved June 30, 1950) to provide relief for the sheep-raising industry by making special quota immigration visas available to certain alien sheepherders; with amendment (Rept. No. 686). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 2976. A bill relating to the activities of temporary and certain other employees of the Bureau of Land Management; with amendment (Rept. No. 689). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. BENTSEN: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3883. A bill to repeal certain laws relating to timber and stone

on the public domain; without amendment (Rept. No. 690). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. ENGLE: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 4288. A bill granting the consent of the Congress to the negotiation of a compact relating to the waters of the Sabine River by the States of Texas and Louisiana; without amendment (Rept. No. 691). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs. House Joint Resolution 210. Joint Resolution to provide a 1-year extension of the 5-year limitation on the time for presenting Indian claims to the Indian Claims Commission; without amendment (Rept. No. 692). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3838. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Joseph Pickett; without amendment (Rept. No. 687). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. MORRIS: Committee on the Interior and Insular Affairs. H. R. 3840. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to issue a patent in fee to Laura A. Craig; without amendment (Rept. No. 688). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 4740. A bill making appropriations for the Departments of State, Justice, Commerce, and the Judiciary for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1952, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 4741. A bill to create the Postal Service as an establishment of the Government accountable only to the Congress, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4742. A bill to provide for appointments to positions of rural carrier in the postal service without regard to political affiliation and to prescribe a penalty with respect to solicitation of political contributions from applicants for such positions; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

H. R. 4743. A bill to amend section 602 of title 18 of the United States Code with respect to solicitation of political contributions from applicants for Federal employment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HESS:

H. R. 4744. A bill to provide for the construction of a suitable building for the Veterans' Administration regional office at Cincinnati, Ohio; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. EDWIN ARTHUR HALL:

H. R. 4745. A bill imposing penalties upon officials or others who make public the names of persons on welfare relief rolls; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PRICE:

H. R. 4746. A bill to equalize certain retirement benefits for commissioned officers of the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. QUINN:

H. R. 4747. A bill to grant additional income-tax exemptions to taxpayers supporting

blind or aged dependents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RHODES:

H. R. 4748. A bill to grant additional income-tax exemptions and deductions to taxpayers who are permanently disabled, and to allow additional income-tax exemptions to taxpayers supporting dependents who are permanently disabled; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 4749. A bill authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to return certain lands to the police jury of Caddo Parish, La.; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CHELF:

H. R. 4750. A bill to increase penalties for the sale of narcotics; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELSTON:

H. R. 4751. A bill to provide for the construction of a suitable building for the Veterans' Administration regional office at Cincinnati, Ohio; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. REGAN:

H. R. 4752. A bill to amend the mineral leasing laws in order to eliminate the waiver of rentals for oil and gas leases; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. WHITAKER:

H. R. 4753. A bill to provide for the payment of increased special pensions to persons holding the Congressional Medal of Honor, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. ROONEY:

H. R. 4754. A bill to provide for the issuance of a special postage stamp in commemoration of the one hundred and seventy-fifth anniversary of the Battle of Brooklyn; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. Con. Res. 141. Concurrent resolution to express the disapproval of the Congress of the arrest and conviction of Archbishop Josef Groesz of Hungary and of William N. Oatis, correspondent for the Associated Press in Prague, and of similar instances of personal, religious, and political persecution; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BAKEWELL:

H. R. 4755. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Emily Wilhelm; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FERNANDEZ:

H. R. 4756. A bill for the relief of George Francis Hammers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GATHINGS:

H. R. 4757. A bill for the relief of Vernelle V. Caruthers and Linda Ann Wells; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCCARTHY:

H. R. 4758. A bill for the relief of Donald James Darmody; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 4759. A bill for the relief of Edward J. Farrell; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MORGAN:

H. R. 4760. A bill for the relief of Irene Proios (nee Vagianos); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIBICOFF:

H. R. 4761. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Elizabeth M. Casey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia:

H. R. 4762. A bill for the relief of Deborah Anita Hudson; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. Res. 319. Resolution for the relief of certain claimants against the United States who suffered personal injuries, property damage,

or other loss as a result of the explosion of a munitions truck between Smithfield and Selma, N. C., on March 7, 1942; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

341. By Mr. LESINSKI: Resolution of the Allied Veterans Council of Michigan, Inc., urging the United States Congress to make necessary changes in the Federal Civil Defense Act; to the Committee on Armed Services.

342. Also, resolution of the Allied Veterans Council of Wayne County, Mich., urging the United States Congress to make necessary financial appropriation for civil defense which will grant city of Detroit sufficient money to purchase necessary air raid warning sirens; to the Committee on Armed Services.

343. Also, resolution of the City Council of the City of Wyandotte, Mich., urging appropriation of necessary funds to deposit the dredged materials from the River Rouge in a location which does not endanger the health of any of the communities on the Detroit River; to the Committee on Public Works.

344. Also, resolution of the Allied Veterans Council of Michigan, Inc., urging legislation giving Korean veterans same GI bill of rights as those enjoyed by veterans of World War II; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

345. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Thad Fusco, city clerk, Cleveland, Ohio, relative to requesting the repeal of the regulation deferring college students who attain certain grades, or pass special aptitude tests, from military service; to the Committee on Armed Services.

346. By Mr. HOPE: Resolution of the First Baptist Church of Lakin, Kans., urging that all grains and fruits now used for the manufacture of all distilled, fermented, and malt beverages be diverted to purposes which are useful in our national defense; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JULY 11, 1951

(Legislative day of Wednesday, June 27, 1951)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Lord God Almighty, who amidst the shifting sands of time standest sure: Like men who turn from dusty toil to the cleansing of crystal streams, so we lift our soiled faces to Thee, from the perplexities and imperfections which crowd the common days. As we pause now in reverent silence, let this high place of the Nation's life, so great a factor in tomorrow's pattern for all men, become the audience chamber of Thy presence. Because there is no solution of the world's ills save as it springs from the hearts of men and because out of the heart are the issues of life, we pray for ourselves. May we stand in this holy place with pure hearts and clean hands. Purify our hearts by Thy grace, feed our minds with Thy truth, guide our feet in the paths of righteousness, for Thy name's sake. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Tuesday, July 10, 1951, was dispensed with.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Snader, its assistant reading clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills of the Senate, severally with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 360. An act for the relief of Stefan Lenartowicz and his wife, Irene;

S. 470. An act for the relief of Sister Bertha Pfeiffer and Sister Elzbieta Zabinska; and

S. 1229. An act for the relief of Jan Josef Wleckowski and his wife and daughter.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 579. An act for the relief of Hendryk Kempski;

H. R. 580. An act for the relief of Kwang Myeng Chu;

H. R. 581. An act for the relief of Isabel Tabit;

H. R. 608. An act for the relief of Kiyoko Matsuo;

H. R. 623. An act for the relief of Carroll O. Switzer;

H. R. 627. An act for the relief of Mrs. Tjitske Bandstra Van Der Velde;

H. R. 644. An act for the relief of Mrs. Shizuko Yamane;

H. R. 677. An act for the relief of Ramute Alexandra Vallokaitis;

H. R. 744. An act for the relief of Wladimir Peter Lewicki, Mrs. Heedwige Lewicki, and George Wladimir Lewicki;

H. R. 796. An act for the relief of Roy F. Wilson;

H. R. 828. An act for the relief of Maj. Bruce B. Calkins;

H. R. 870. An act for the relief of Anton Bernhard Blikstad;

H. R. 970. An act for the relief of Antonios Charalambou;

H. R. 982. An act for the relief of Willem Smits;

H. R. 1136. An act for the relief of Sister Natalie (Marie Palagyi) and Sister Alice (Elizabeth Slachta);

H. R. 1420. An act for the relief of Dr. Eugen Jose Singer and Mrs. Frieda Singer;

H. R. 1454. An act for the relief of George Crisan;

H. R. 1485. An act for the relief of R. E. Agee and Margaret E. Agee;

H. R. 1598. An act for the relief of Hanoh Sarapanovschi (also known as Hanoh Charat), Gizela (Gizele) Sarapanovschi (nee Levy) and Philippe Sarapanovschi;

H. R. 1688. An act for the relief of James J. Lieberman;

H. R. 1920. An act for the relief of Hoshi Kazuo;

H. R. 1961. An act for the relief of Guy Christian;

H. R. 2158. An act for the relief of Sister M. Crocefissa and Sister M. Reginalda;

H. R. 2160. An act for the relief of Sister M. Leonida;

H. R. 2275. An act for the relief of J. Alfred Pullham;

H. R. 2292. An act for the relief of Jal Young Lee;